

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10344

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/baptistsystemexa00sei

THE

BAPTIST SYSTEM EXAMINED,

THE CHURCH VINDICATED,

AND SECTARIANISM REBUKED.

A REVIEW OF DR. FULLER AND OTHERS

ON

"Baptism and the Terms of Communion."

BY

REV. J. A. SEISS, A.M.

PASTOR OF LOMBARD STREET LUTHERAN CHURCH, BALTIMORE, MD.

THIRD EDITION REVISED AND ENLARGED.

BALTIMORE:

T. NEWTON KURTZ,

No. 151 WEST PRATT STREET.

1859.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1858, by
T. NEWTON KURTZ,
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Maryland.

STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON AND CO.
PHILADELPHIA.

PREFACE.

This book has grown out of a series of articles published in the Lutheran Observer during the winter and spring of 1854, which, with a few emendations and additions, soon after appeared in a small volume, which has been for some time out of print. The constant inquiry for it, and the urgent solicitations of the publisher, have induced the author to prepare it for a new edition. It has been mostly rewritten, materially enlarged, and is now meant to be a compact *résumé* of the whole controversy. The aim of the author has been to produce something more than is to be found in the ordinary and small treatises on the subject, and something less elaborate and scholastic than the larger works which are seldom found outside of the libraries of the learned. The book is designed to give, in a form adapted to the common reader, a full view of the questions between us and Baptists, and thus to aid pastors in ridding themselves of the annoyances to which an insolent, fawning, and insidious sectarianism often subjects them.

The author has endeavored to "speak the truth in love." If comment has occasionally assumed a tone of severity, facts and fidelity not only excuse but demand it. The wisdom that comes from above prefers purity to peace. Truth will admit of no compromises with

error. It must be spoken; and to speak it without feeling is to treat it with indifference. The malicious and slanderous intentions which have been assigned, from the pulpit and elsewhere, as the motives prompting the former issues of this work, are firmly disclaimed. The author does not beg for favors, but he insists upon justice. The teachings of Baptists are full of the grossest assaults upon the Church and its ordinances, which, with our convictions, we are in duty bound to meet and expose. "Earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints," is an inspired injunction which the writer does not feel at liberty to neglect. He believes that Baptists are in serious error, and he would reclaim them if possible, at least check their misdirected zeal, by showing that material modifications of their system are essential to harmonize it with the truth. And above all would he furnish to sincere, unsuspecting, but uninformed people the means of protection against the mischievous entanglements of a sectarianism which holds in its very life the excommunication of all but its own abettors.

May God bless this attempt to defend the Church from the imposition of a modal observance not required in his word, and overrule its destiny to the restraint of unwarranted proscriptiveness and to the praise of his ever-adorable name!

Baltimore, September 1st, 1858.

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.

	PAGE
CHAP. I.—Introductory Observations—Question stated	9
II.—General Arguments	18
III.—Meaning of the Word Bapto	29
IV.—The Addition of zo	43
V.—The Question of Divers Significations	51
VI.—Baptizo—The Lexicons	57
VII.—Baptizo—The Classics	67
VIII.—Baptizo—The Authorities	89
IX.—Baptizo—The Septuagint	105
X.—Baptizo—The Fathers	118
XI.—Baptizo in the New Testament—Preliminary Question	137
XII.—Baptizo in the New Testament—Jewish Lustrations	150
XIII.—Baptizo in the New Testament—Its True Meaning	164
XIV.—Mode of Baptism—Scriptural Hints	185
XV.—Mode of Baptism—Baptist Arguments	203
XVI.—Mode of Baptism—Baptist Arguments continued	234

PAGE

CHAP. XVII.—History of Baptism as to Mode..... 248
XVIII.—Mode of Baptism practiced by the Greek Church..... 260
XIX.—Developments and Tendencies of the Baptist System..... 268
XX.—Analogy—An Independent Argument against the Baptist Dogma..... 277

PART SECOND.

XXI.—Infant Baptism no Sin..... 286
XXII.—Infant Baptism not contrary to the Commission..... 294
XXIII.—Relations of Infants to the Kingdom—An Argument for their Baptism..... 317
XXIV.—Infant Baptism practiced by the Apostles 337

PART THIRD.

XXV.—The Terms of Communion..... 371

THE

BAPTIST SYSTEM EXAMINED.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS—THE QUESTION PRESENTED.

Baptism is an appointment of God,—a sacrament of our holy religion. The command of Jesus is, "Go, teach [make disciples, or Christians, of] all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." It is not a matter of indifference whether we have been baptized or not. The apostle classes baptism among "the principles of the doctrine of Christ." It is vitally connected with Christianity itself. Every Christian should therefore know in what it consists, and who may properly receive it. The disagreements which have sprung up upon these points are much to be regretted.

For the most part, those who hold to baptism as an external ordinance maintain and teach, that

it is the religious application of water, according to the formulary of Christ, by an authorized minister of the gospel, in any quantity, to any subject that is at all in the condition of being made a learner in Christ. It also seems remarkable that any should dissent from this view of what the Scriptures teach in the case. There is, however, a large and varied class of religionists who differ from this general understanding of the Church, and insist, even to the excommunication of those who do not think with them, that there is no true and valid baptism where the subject is not an adult believer, and wholly immersed in water. Book after book has been written, and circulated with unfaltering industry, charging the Church with apostasy from Christ's commands on this subject for more than a thousand years.

One of the more recent productions on this controversy, is a 12mo volume of 251 pages, entitled "*Baptism and the Terms of Communion: an Argument, by Richard Fuller.*" This book is published by authority, has reached its third edition, and is distributed and spoken of by Baptists as presenting the chief strength of their position. Its author is known as a gentleman of fortune, an ex-lawyer, a doctor of divinity, and a minister highly esteemed and honored by the people with whom he operates. He professes to write in a catholic and fraternal spirit; and, with the exception of a few of his fundamental positions, he evidently presents some improvement upon the temper of those whose exploded philology and logic he has so diligently collected and reproduced. He avows

himself *"a Baptist on principle, and not in sectarianism nor bigotry;"* that is, he claims to be an exception to Baptists generally, who, if we are to take the implications of his own avowal, are both sectarian and bigoted. How far he is entitled to this exemption will appear more clearly in what is to follow. We take up his book, and shall assign it the prominent place in this treatise, because it is one of the most recent on that side of the question, and presents all the latest phases of the Baptist argument, and is considered by some as unanswerable.

To which of the many tribes of the Baptist denomination Dr. Fuller belongs, he does not tell us. He rather insinuates that he does not exactly coincide with either class of that diversified household. This is, perhaps, the most convenient way to excuse himself from responsibility for some of the more disagreeable features connected with the Baptist system. Indeed, whatever exceptions we may be compelled to take to his doctrines or his logic, we may readily accord to him much tact and shrewdness as a dialectician. His *"Argument,"* to those unacquainted with the subject, bears an air of plausibility very well calculated to make an impression. His dexterous evasions, his subtle management to pass off for granted the very things to be proven, his array of learned authorities on points which nobody denies, and the whining affectation with which he presents his doctrines, to say nothing of his misrepresentations and unreliable quotations, give to his book a certain factitious force, to which his cause is by

no means entitled, and which, by divine help, we propose to reduce to its real nothingness.

For Dr. Fuller personally we have none but the kindest feelings. We trust that, with all his mistakes and false reasonings, he is conscientious and sincere. The numerous unfortunate predicaments in which he has placed himself in his book may have resulted, in part, from habits brought with him from another profession, but much more from the mistakes, to say nothing worse, of those whom he has chosen as his guides. We will not say of him, as the biographer of Carson has said of the rejecters of the Baptist system, that "*want of religious honesty*" has been the controlling secret. He is a fellow-laborer in the gospel in the same city with us. He is respected as a Christian. We award to his intentions the character of uprightness. If conscience did permit, we would rather agree than dispute with him. We have no love for controversy. It pains us as much to be driven into these contentions about sacred things as it pains Dr. Fuller and his friends to exclude us from the table of the Lord. It is not that we love our Baptist brethren less, but because we love truth more, that we have been induced to take up the pen in this connection.

This, however, is the fact, that Dr. Fuller, in common with others, has ventured upon a movement of aggression upon the cherished faith and practice of millions upon millions of Christian believers. He has solemnly and emphatically given out the charge, that about one hundred and ninety-five out of every two hundred of the great

household of Christ are guilty of downright and palpable violation of one of the plainest and most positive commands of the Savior, that they are quite outside of the true visible Church, and that they are occupying a position of risk and jeopardy enough to alarm every serious mind. In this we believe him to be altogether mistaken. But he has pressed the matter with all his strength, and continues to press it, and hundreds more are devoting their time and energies almost exclusively to the same point; and there is no alternative left us but to surrender our convictions and the liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, or to take up one of the swords which have been defiantly crossed before us. We have no fault to find with our Baptist friends for choosing to perform their baptisms by immersion. This is a liberty of which we have no wish to deprive them. But the arrogant assumptions with which it is sought to brand our baptism as not only invalid but profane, and the unwarranted exclusiveness of denying to us a place in the visible Church or any good hope of heaven, we cannot give place to by subjection, no, not for an hour, lest the truth of the gospel be wrested from us. We stand entirely on the defensive. And, if Dr. Fuller is disposed to complain that his teachings are controverted, let him not forget the daring assault which he has made upon the faith and hope of myriads of God's children. If he should feel himself incommoded by the resistance encountered, let him recollect that he has "cast the glove."

To those familiar with the Baptist controversy

it is hardly necessary to state the features of the system which Dr. Fuller's "argument" is designed to sustain. It is that maintained in common by Campbellites, Christ-ians, Tunkers, Millerites, and all other Baptists. We do not attribute to him all the vagaries and heresies of the parties named, but mean, simply, that the system which he supports is that supported by all Baptists. But, as he disclaims being a Baptist in the departments of "sectarianism and bigotry," and is very solicitous that his reviewers should quote him fairly, it may be as well, once for all, to show what his position is. It may be summed up in the following particulars:—

1. *That baptism is immersion in water; and that where there is not a total immersion there is no baptism.* He says, "*Baptizo* always denotes a total immersion." "Jesus commands his disciples to be immersed." "The very thing, the only act he commands, is immersion." (Pp. 19, 50, 70.)

2. That *all baptisms*,—though performed by regular ministers with the solemn design to administer Christ's ordinance, though the subjects be believers devoutly intending to receive the baptismal sacrament, though the holy name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost be reverently invoked,—*unless the whole body be immersed, are altogether vain and nugatory, and the parties remain unbaptized.* He evinces a singular cautiousness and reserve as to the plain and categorical avowal of this inevitable sequence of his first position; but the evidence that this is his doctrine is so clear, as well upon the face as in the very marrow of his "argu-

ment," that he will not dare to disclaim it. "No one can partake of the [Lord's] Supper," says he, "who is not a member in a visible Church." "Baptism is a prerequisite to admission into a visible Church properly organized." "*Baptizo* signifies to immerse, and has no other meaning." "We cannot admit to the Supper those whom we regard as unbaptized." "We cannot recognize church-membership in Pedobaptist Churches as conferring any sort of title to the Supper." "To admit them would be to admit members without baptism." It is plain, then, that he repudiates all baptisms which have not been performed by the total immersion of the subject.

3. That *to refuse to be immersed is disobedience to a positive command, involving a degree of criminality making the prospect of final salvation exceedingly problematical.* This is another point on which he is a little unsteady,—now half affirming, and then half denying,—at one time seeming to recognize us as his dear brethren in Christ, and at another time pointing with horror to our dreadful danger by reason of our disobedience in the one thing of going under the water. But why this mouthing of a matter so solemn, and entering so vitally into this controversy? Why not out boldly and fairly? *We are either Christians entitled to heaven, or we are not.* If we are Christians accepted of God, then all this ado about *baptizo* and immersion is sheer nonsense and sectarian chicanery, and the *unimmersed*, if obedient in other respects, are as good and as safe as the *immersed*, whether once or thrice, backwards or forwards. If Dr. Fuller

admits this, he surrenders his cause, and the controversy is at an end; and, if he does not admit it, then he maintains that the salvation of the unimmersed is exceedingly doubtful, and he can have no clear hope of meeting any of them in heaven. But hear him:—"My dear reader, the matter before you is not an abstraction: it is a plain duty which meets you at the very threshold of the Christian course, and *which you may not evade without* INSULT TO THE SAVIOR AND PERIL TO YOUR SOUL." "I regard baptism just as I do any other command; and I dare not trench upon God's prerogative and decide what is to be *the consequence in eternity* of disobedience to any command." "Do not say we lay too much stress on baptism [*i.e.* immersion]. Upon this point I adjure you not to upbraid us, but to obey Christ." (Pp. 101, 104, 105.) In what light do these statements place our author but in that of holding that the absence of immersion disqualifies for heaven?

4. That *to baptize an infant is not only useless, but an infraction of the command of Christ, and a positive sin.* "Infant baptism," says he, "makes void the commandment of God by a human tradition." "It reflects ingloriously upon God and tarnishes the glory of the atonement." He even compares the practice of it to the scenes of "Bedlam." (Pp. 207, 209, 123.)

5. That *the wisest and holiest men on earth have no right whatever to the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper so long as they have not been immersed in water.* He says, "WE CANNOT RECOGNIZE CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP IN THESE BODIES [*Pedobaptist Churches*]

AS CONFERRING ANY SORT OF TITLE TO THE SUPPER," (p. 238.) These are plain words.

We do not suppose that Dr. Fuller will pronounce these quotations unfair. If these particulars do not present the doctrinal essence of his book, it teaches nothing, and his "argument" is a mere beating of the air. We have no wish to ascribe to him what he has not avowed in some tangible shape. We do not, therefore, misrepresent him, or in the least pervert his meaning, when we affirm that, according to him, Christ has commanded men to be immersed; that all who are not immersed are outside of the pale of the visible Church, and in great danger of losing their souls; that to administer baptism to an infant is an evil and a wicked prostitution of a Christian ordinance; and that the practice of infant baptism, or refusal to be immersed, is disobedience to Christ, involving and arguing unfitness to partake of the Holy Supper, and furnishing ground to fear exclusion from heaven.

ALL THIS WE EMPHATICALLY DENY. Here, then, we join issue, and invite all to hear, and consider, and decide for the truth, on whichever side it may be found.

CHAPTER II.

GENERAL ARGUMENTS.

Before proceeding to analyze the Baptist argument as Dr. Fuller has presented it, we desire to advert to a few general considerations which weigh so strongly against his doctrine, as to be themselves conclusive unless confronted with the most solid and inflexible proofs to the contrary.

I. The whole gospel system is a system of *liberty* It was so predicted: Isa. xlii. 7, lxi. 1. It was so proclaimed by its first preachers: Rom. vii. 6, viii. 2; Gal. v. 1. It is specifically presented as a system of freedom from the bondage of burdensome ceremonies: Gal. iv. 3–7. Paul says expressly, "If ye be dead with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances?" (Col. ii. 20.) "Why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience?" (1 Cor. x. 29.) "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." (Gal. v. 1.) And how dissonant with this "perfect law of liberty," how subversive of the free spirit of the gospel, how like the old bondage to grievous ceremonies, and how unlikely to be

a part of the glorious economy of grace, to have all its sublime blessings bound up in and made dependent on the miserable little external *accident* of being far enough in the waters of baptism to have them close for an instant over our heads! How utterly foreign to the whole strain and spirit of "the better covenant" that even the least of its precious promises should be linked with such a mere *puncto* of outward ceremony! The thing is so grossly incongruous with all that relates to the nature of a system pre-eminently spiritual and gracious, that it cannot be soberly entertained for a moment, except upon the clearest and most unexceptionable proofs.

II. The vast and overwhelming majority of all Christian people for many, many ages, including multitudes whose names the Church wears upon her heart as the jewelry of the cross,—men as conscientious, holy, studious, learned, and gifted by the Spirit as any that ever sunk beneath the waters,—men who fought the battles of the Lord, and won to themselves holy renown as wide as Christendom and lasting as the world,—have maintained that there is no law requiring Christians to be immersed, and were themselves never immersed. And are we to believe that they were all unbaptized, all unqualified to commune in the holy Supper, all outside of the visible Church, all fundamentally wrong in their views of the first principles of Christianity, and that it is doubtful whether any of them have reached heaven? How dare we thus sunder the cords of sympathy which

bind us to our fathers, and extinguish the glowing hope of meeting them in glory? How can we thus asperse their fame and insult their memories and their honored graves? Well does Dr. Fuller speak of this as "*a matter which is painful.*" But the very painfulness of it is a powerful presumption against the truth of his system, and a presumption which cannot be set aside except by the resistless force of demonstration itself. To talk of "lodged and incurable prejudices" does not mend the matter, but only adds a deeper tinge of sadness to our contemplations of the honored dead. If our illustrious ancestors and predecessors were all in error, if the world's great lights were all so far from the truth, as the Baptist theory teaches, let us not be taunted by the mockery of consolation that theirs was a wilful blindness. We are sorry to find our Baptist friends in such hot haste to pass from this point the very moment it is touched. It is a great and interesting inquiry,—one which, next to that of our own personal salvation, is the most important and absorbing involved in this debate. To declare it "impertinent" does neither render it so nor meet the question. And, if Dr. Fuller is an exception among Baptists, he has shown upon this point that he is not so far an exception among men as to be able to grasp a hot iron with a steady firmness. The very thought seems to appall him,—as well it may,—and he hastens to bury it out of his own and his reader's sight. We here again drag it forth to his view as a thing which he must face or give up his theory. We press it upon

every immersionist, not as absolute proof of the error of his system, but as presumptive evidence against him which must be taken as decisive unless set aside by testimony which will admit of no escape.

III. Mere modes and ceremonial particulars are never treated of in connection with other appointments of Christ; and we cannot conceive how baptism should be made an exception. Christ has enjoined the celebration of the holy Supper; but he has said nothing as to the outward manner in which that sacrament is to be observed. He ordained the Christian ministry, but has said nothing as to how we are to go to the nations, or as to the mode in which we are to deliver the gospel message. He has made it obligatory upon us not to forsake the assembling of ourselves together for public worship; but he has enjoined nothing as to how these sacred convocations are to be held, or as to the specific ritual by which their exercises are to be regulated. He has made it our duty to pray; but he has not designated the times for it, nor told us whether it is to be done kneeling, standing, sitting, extempore, or from a written form. And so in regard to all his great commandments: it is the thing in its real substance which he enjoins, whilst the particular mode of it is left free to be adapted to circumstances. And, as specific forms or modes have no essential connection with any other great requirements of God, the strong presumption is that it is the same in the case of baptism. It is the spiritual

substance of the thing that the Scriptures are concerned with, and little variable external accidents are not taken into account. The spiritual essence of baptism is induction or inauguration into the faith of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. It is upon this that the Scriptures continually fix, without even so much as specifically prescribing the element to be used, much less the mode in which it is to be used. All analogy, therefore, is against the Baptist theory, and must forever overrule it, unless demonstration of the most positive nature can be produced to the contrary.

IV. The scope and meaning of baptism itself is against the doctrine of our Baptist brethren. It is the sacrament of regeneration and remission of sins. The command of Peter on the day of Pentecost was, "Be baptized, every one of you, for the remission of sins." (Acts ii. 38.) Ananias said to Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." (Acts xxii. 16.) Jesus says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," (John iii. 8;) a passage concerning which Wall justly says, "There is not any one Christian writer, of any antiquity, in any language, but who understands it of baptism; and, if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water any more than born of wood." Paul speaks of Christians as "saved by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost;" as having "put off the body of the sins of the flesh *by the circumcision of Christ.*" (Tit. iii. 5, 6; Col. ii. 11, 13.) Peter says,

"Baptism doth also now save us;" a sacrament which he describes to be, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." (1 Peter iii. 21.) Christ gave himself for the Church, "that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." (Eph. v. 25, 26.) Irenæus styles baptism "our regeneration unto God." (Lib. i. cap. 18.) Tertullian calls it "the happy sacrament of water, whereby we are washed from the sins of our former blindness and recovered to eternal life." (Mason's Selections, p. 111.) Origen says, "The baptism of the Church is given for the remission of sins." Augustine exclaims, "Behold! persons are baptized, then all their sins are forgiven." (Sermon on Rom. viii. 30.) Upon the question, "What are the benefits of baptism?" Luther answers, "It works the forgiveness of sins." (Small Cat., Part 4.) Calvin says, "Remission of sins is so dependent on baptism that it cannot by any means be separated from it." (Inst., tom. iv. cap. 15, sec. 4. The Confession of Helvetia says, "To be baptized in the name of Christ is to be enrolled, entered, and received into covenant and family, and so into the inheritance of the sons of God. Baptism, according to the institution of the Lord, is the fount of regeneration." The Bohemian Confession calls it "the sacrament of the new birth; that is, of regeneration or washing with water in the word of life." The Confession of France says that in it "we are engrafted into Christ's body, that, being washed in his blood, we may also be renewed to holiness of life." Knapp,

whom Dr. Fuller quotes with so much approbation, says, "Baptism represents purification from sins, and is designed to promote this end in the one who is baptized." (Theol., vol. ii. p. 510.) Flacius says, "Baptism, and to be baptized, means an internal washing, remission of sins, and an ever-continuing renewal." (Clavis's Scrip. Sac., art. Bapt., p. 66.)

But to multiply authorities upon this point is needless. All sound theologians admit and contend that baptism, in its true acceptation, is not a mere external ordinance, but a sacrament of deep spiritual import, in which the soul is absolved from guilt and savingly incorporated with Jesus Christ.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not teach or hold the doctrine ordinarily called "Baptismal Regeneration;" *i.e.* we do not believe that the mere application of water to a human subject, in any mode or quantity, can wash away sins or work any subjective change in the heart. What we affirm, and what we understand to be affirmed in these quotations, is, that baptism is a thing for the soul as well as for the body; that it fails to become true baptism unless attended or followed with spiritual experience, conformity to the baptismal vow, and that purity of heart which the water typifies; that this high spiritual conception of this sacrament is the only true conception of it; and that, *in this respect*, it carries with it the virtue and efficacy which are here ascribed to it. It is a thing which relates to the inner man and to the relations and experiences of the spirit. It is "not

the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God."

What, we would then ask, has *quantity* of *water* to do with these internal and spiritual things, with giving a man a good conscience or inspiring him with a new life? The whole office of the mere *water* of baptism is to represent and typify an inward purification, a renovation of the soul, without which baptism fails to be baptism, and becomes a mere profitless, dead work. And surely no man in his senses will pretend to deny that a few handfuls of water from the crystal spring can as well symbolize *purity* as tons of the contents of the filthy pools or stagnant cisterns to which Baptists ordinarily invite their converts. "I admit," says Carson, "that sprinkling a little water on any part of the body might be an emblem of purification." (P. 164.) To those who can dispute so plain a proposition we have no reply to make. And the very fact that baptism looks to the purification of the spirit and the washing away of sins, renders it almost impossible to believe for one moment that the validity and force of so spiritual a sacrament should depend upon the depth of the water used in its outward administration.

V. Looking at the foundation upon which Dr. Fuller rests the whole fabric of his proscriptive system, we are at once struck with the extraordinary fact that his entire argument comprises nothing but a mere philological disquisition upon the meaning of *one little Greek word*. The entire eleven chapters devoted to this part of the subject

are occupied with the one single point, What does *baptizo* mean? "The matter before us," says he, "is a calm philological inquiry as to the meaning of a Greek word. . . . The simple inquiry is, as to the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*." (P. 12.) His interpretation of this simple word is the alpha and omega, the beginning, middle, and end, the body, soul, and spirit, of all he has to present to prove that ninety-five hundredths of Christ's people are in a state of downright disobedience to their Lord, unfit for membership in "our churches," or to approach the Lord's Supper, and without any sure or reliable hope of final salvation. This certainly is very remarkable, that the great law of the gospel, and a point involving the eternal well-being and affecting the hopes of millions of Christian people, should be made to turn upon one little word. Is it not an astounding doctrine, that in a divine revelation forming a library in itself a merciful and condescending God should have suspended the issues of his sublime scheme of grace upon the doubtful import of one single Greek word? According to the ancient prophets, the way of salvation is an open "highway," in which "wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err," (Isa. xxxv. 8,)—so "plain that he may run that readeth it," (Hab. ii. 2,)—and laid down in divers forms, "precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little." (Isa. xxviii. 10.) But it seems, after all, that we must take Dr. Fuller's say-so, or go to the study of *Greek*, before we can learn it; that the whole question lies in the interpretation of one

Greek word; and that we must go back to the old heathen writers to ascertain whether we are Christians, and consult Orpheus, Heraclides Ponticus, Polybius, the Greek scholiasts on Euripides and Aratus, Alcibiades, Anacreon, Æsop, and Diodorus Siculus, to find out whether or not we have a good hope for heaven! Let the reader but look at it, and consider the real nature of the question, and the real character of the testimony adduced to decide it, and he will find that Dr. Fuller's "argument" bears absurdities upon its very face into which we would hardly think it possible for a sane man to fall.

VI. It is also a very remarkable fact, and hard to be accounted for, that, if the Baptist theory be true, it was so long in being discovered. The doctrine that "*baptizo* means to immerse and nothing else" is one of but recent development. It is nowhere so taught in all the records of antiquity. Until within a few scores of years, it lay concealed from all the learned men of all ages and nations. We have histories of Greek literature from Homer, a thousand years before Christ was born, to Constantinus Harmenopulus, nearly fourteen hundred years since Christ left this world, including all the writings of the poets, orators, historians, physicians, philosophers, mathematicians, geographers, rhetoricians, and philologists of Greece, the Greek fathers of the Christian Church, and the Byzantine writers of the Middle Ages; and yet we have no account for all that time, nor up to a very recent period, that any author ever assumed the position

by which it is now sought to excommunicate the great majority of the most eminent, active, and devout followers of Jesus on the face of the earth. Is not this exceedingly wonderful? Who can believe that a truth so essential to the very existence of the Church—assuming it to be a truth—would have remained in such obscurity, so entirely hidden from the most careful observations of all men, until this eleventh hour of the world? Why, the allegations of the Mormon prophet with regard to his new revelation are hardly less credible. Surely, the theory of our Baptist friends is neither in the Bible, nor in the Greek language, or else the high place of the subject in the Christian system would needs have secured for it the notice of scholars and divines, or engaged some special providence to bring it into view long ere this.

We submit, then, that these *prima facie* and *à priori* considerations so embarrass, cripple, and contradict the whole Baptist scheme, that they must be conclusive of the question unless they can be confronted with direct, positive, and unequivocal evidences to the contrary.

What sort of evidences Dr. Fuller offers, will be our next subject of inquiry.

CHAPTER III.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD "BAPTO."

All must agree that the word *baptizo*, which is the disputed word in this controversy, is a derivative of the word *bapto*. It is equally certain that one of the ways of ascertaining the meaning of a secondary word is to find out the signification of its root or primitive. But, upon this law of interpretation, Dr. Fuller, if we understand him aright, has undertaken to differ from other people. We say if we understand him rightly; for there is a nebulosity about this part of his "argument" which renders it difficult of comprehension. Though he names his mental processes, as he has here given them, "a calm philological inquiry," we defy any man to find an equal number of pages under such a title so utterly barren of hermeneutical reasoning and illustration, or so full of confusion and absurdities. We shall endeavor, however, to extract the component elements of his "disquisition," and to classify its jumbled departments, so as to reason upon them intelligently and in order.

Dr. Fuller starts out by affirming that we have nothing to do with *bapto* in this controversy. This is his first canon, to the paternity of which he is

exclusively entitled. No respectable writer, even of his school, so far as we know, has ever taken such a position. Neither does he accompany it with the least attempt at proof,—as though it were a thing which nobody would dare to call in question. His friend Mr. Carson, on whom he so confidently relies, declares that the word *baptizo* is formed from *bapto*. Indeed, Dr. Fuller himself subsequently loses sight of his own declaration, and proceeds to found an argument on *bapto* to prove that *baptizo* means immerse and nothing else. "In the Greek language," says he, "the addition of *zo* rather enforces than diminishes the primitive verb;" as, "*bapto*, to dip; *baptizo*, to make one dip." We will therefore endeavor to ascertain first the meaning of *bapto*, and then examine the value or force of the addition of *zo*, and thus show that Dr. Fuller's doctrine concerning the word *baptizo* is a sheer assumption and forever untenable.

Now, we assert, and will prove to the reader's satisfaction, that *bapto*, so far from meaning a total submersion and nothing else, means also *to wash, to cleanse, to wet, to moisten, to bedew, to stain, to tinge*, and *to dye, without regard to mode*, and in some cases even *to sprinkle*.

Our first appeal is to the lexicographers, whom Mr. Campbell, from whom Dr. Fuller has extensively drawn, pronounces "the most learned and the most competent witnesses in this case in the world." (Debate with Rice, p. 58.)

We begin with the native Greeks, who, according to high Baptist authority, are unexceptionable

guides in this matter, and must needs understand their own language better than foreigners.

The first is *Hesychius*, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian era, and is the oldest native Greek lexicographer with whom we are acquainted. He defines the word *bapto*. He assigns to it but one general meaning; and that meaning he finds in the word *antleo*, which signifies *to draw or pump water*, and has no reference whatever to mode or immersion.

2. Next in order is *Gases*, also a native Greek, who compiled a large and valuable lexicon of the ancient Greek language, which is generally used and held in high estimation by those who speak the Greek. He defines *bapto* by *brecho, pluno, gemizo, buthizo, antleo;* that is, *to wet, moisten*, or *bedew; to wash, to fill, to dip; to draw or pump water.*

3. *Hedericus* defines the word *bapto* by "mergo, immergo, tingo, intingo, lavo;" that is, *to dip, to plunge, to tinge*, TO DYE, TO WASH.

4. *Coulon* defines *bapto* by "mergo, tingo, abluo;" that is, *to dip, to dye*, TO CLEANSE.

5. *Ursinus* defines it by "abluo, *aspergo;*" that is, *to wash*, TO SPRINKLE.

6. *Scapula* defines it by "mergo, immergo,—item tingo, inficere, imbruere,—item lavo;" that is, to dip, to plunge,—also to stain or tinge, to dye, imbrue,—ALSO TO WASH.

7. *Schrevelius* defines it by "mergo, intingo, *lavo, haurio;*" that is, to dip, dye, *wash, draw water.*

8. *Donnegan* translates *bapto* "to dip, to plunge

into water, to submerge, *to wash,* to dye, to color, *to wash,* to draw out water."

9. *Pickering* renders it, to dip; to steep, dye, color; *to wash; to draw up; to fill by drawing up; to bathe one's self.*

10. *Liddell and Scott* render it, to dip; to dip in dye, color, steep; *to dye the hair.*

11. *Dunbar* renders it, to dip, plunge, immerse; *to wash; to wet, moisten,* SPRINKLE; to dye, stain, color.

Now, if these lexicographers are "the most learned and the most competent witnesses in this case in the world," as the most learned Baptists have admitted, our position is already made out and sustained. Every man acquainted with the Latin knows that *lavo* means simply to *wash,* without regard to mode; and that, when it occasionally departs from its simple and direct meaning, it signifies *sprinkling* as well as any other application of water. Ainsworth, Andrews, Anthon, and others give *besprinkle* and bedew as among its significations. Hedericus, Scapula, Schrevelius, give *lavo* as one of the fixed meanings of *bapto. Abluo* certainly means simply to *wash* or *cleanse;* and Coulon and Ursinus give *abluo* as the meaning of *bapto. Brecho* unquestionably means simply to wet, moisten, or bedew, and so *pluno* means simply to *wash,* or *cleanse;* and these are the first and prominent meanings which Gases applies to *bapto.* And Donnegan, Pickering, and Dunbar, in plain English, give *wash* as a proper interpretation of *bapto.* Washing and cleansing do not necessarily imply immersion. Moistening, bedew-

ing, sprinkling, staining, and dyeing the hair, preclude immersion altogether. BAPTO, THEREFORE, DOES NOT ALWAYS MEAN TO IMMERSE AND NOTHING ELSE.

To the lexicographers we add a few authorities. One of particular value in this controversy is from the distinguished Baptist critic, Alexander Carson, of Tubbermore, Ireland. "*Bapto,*" says he, "*signifies* TO DYE BY SPRINKLING, AS PROPERLY AS BY DIPPING, though originally it was confined to the latter." He refers to examples, in which, he says, "*it could not be known even that* BAPTO *has the meaning of dip.*" "The word," says he, "has come by appropriation to denote dyeing, *without reference to mode.*" "Nor are such applications of the word to be accounted for by metaphor, as Dr. Gale asserts. THEY ARE AS LITERAL AS THE PRIMITIVE MEANING." (Pp. 44, 45, 51, Carson on Baptism.) According to this lauded scholar, then, *bapto,* so far from always signifying immersion, is often used in its literal sense where mode is altogether excluded.

Another authority is Edwards, who was for many years a respected Baptist minister. "I will say thus much of the term *bapto,*" says he: "that it is a term of *such latitude* that he who shall attempt to prove, from its use in various authors, an absolute and total immersion, will find he has undertaken that which he cannot perform."

Another is the Methodist theologian, Dr. Watson, who says, "The verb *bapto,* with its derivatives, signifies to dip the hand into a dish, to stain

a vesture with blood, to wet the body with dew, to paint or smear the face with colors, to stain the hand by pressing a substance, to be overwhelmed in the waters as a sunken ship, to be drowned by falling into the water, to sink in the neuter sense, to immerse totally, to plunge up to the neck, to be immersed up to the middle, to be drunk with wine, to be dyed, tinged, or imbued, *to wash by affusion of water*, to pour water upon the hands or any part of the body, *to besprinkle*."

Professor Wilson, of the Royal College, Belfast, says, "That *bapto* denotes *to dye, without regard to mode*, and even where immersion is in terms excluded, is beyond the pale of candid disputation."

All this ought to be enough to satisfy men on this subject. It is competent, however, to go beyond lexicons and authorities to the passages in which the word *bapto* is used. We therefore make an appeal to the Greek language itself. We will begin with the Septuagint, or Greek version of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, as being the most nearly related to the writings of the New Testament, the teachings of which on this subject it is our wish to ascertain.

In Daniel iv. 33 (we give the reference as in the English Bible) it is written, "And he [Nebuchadnezzar] was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body [*ebaphae*] *was wet* with [*apo, from*] the dew of heaven." Also in Daniel v. 21: "They fed him with grass like oxen, and his body [*ebaphae*] *was wet* with the dew of heaven." Here is *bapto* in two instances, in both of which it signifies the gentle moistening of an

exposed body from the falling dew. Was it a case of immersion? Mr. Carson says, "If all the water in the ocean had thus fallen on the monarch, it would not have been a literal immersion. The mode would still be wanting." (P. 36.) Neither was it a *figurative* any more than a literal immersion. It was simply *a wetting;* and no man can make any thing more out of it.

In Leviticus xiv. 4–6, we have these words, "Then shall the priest command to take for him that is to be cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop; and the priest shall command that *one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel,* OVER RUNNING WATER. As for the living bird, he shall take it, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, and shall [*bapsei*] *dip* them and the living bird *in the blood of the bird* that was killed." Here is a case of the use of *bapto* where total immersion was an impossibility. How can you totally immerse a living bird, cedar-wood, scarlet, and hyssop in the blood of a single bird? Dr. Fuller is evidently embarrassed with this passage, and disposes of it in a way exceedingly reprehensible. He tells us that he "trembles when he remembers the language of God as to him who adds to or takes from the words of the Bible." We are therefore surprised at the liberty which he has taken with the verses we have just quoted. On page 45, under express pretensions to honesty, where he charges that others have been dishonest, he records these words:—"If my readers will refer to the chapter, they will see that water was to be taken from a running stream

in some vessel, and *into this water* the blood of the bird was to fall, into this vessel the dipping was to be performed." We believe that he has imported this from Mr. Carson, who has led him astray on more than one point. But, from whatever source he obtained it, it is simply untrue. There is nothing of the sort in the record of the case. His reference to verses 50, 51 will not relieve the palpable misrepresentation which he has put upon record. Those verses refer to the cleansing of A HOUSE; the case in point refers to the cleansing of A MAN. But neither are his statements true in the case of the house. His language is as follows:—"First, *the blood is poured into a vessel of running water.*" (We have heard of *wooden, earthen,* and *brazen* vessels; but we have yet to learn what is meant by "vessels of running water"!) But such is our author's version of this prescription:—"First, the blood *is poured into a vessel of running water.* Then the things are dipped. Lastly, the defiled objects are sprinkled." Now, look at the passage of which this pretends to be the luminous explanation. You will observe that it contains nothing about *the pouring* of the blood, and nothing about *vessels of running water.* Moses knew nothing about such ceremonies or such utensils for the cleansing of lepers. Here is the passage to which Dr. Fuller specifically refers:—"And he shall take to cleanse the house two birds, and cedar-wood, and scarlet, and hyssop; and he shall kill the one of the two birds *in an earthen vessel,* OVER *running water;* and he shall take the cedar-wood, and the hyssop, and the scarlet, and

the living bird, and [*bapsei*] *shall dip them in* THE BLOOD OF THE SLAIN BIRD." Thus far there was no mingling of water in the provision for cleansing either a house or a man. The "earthen vessel," and the dying bird *in it*, were only to be held "OVER *running water*." The living bird, and the cedar-wood, and the scarlet, and the hyssop, were then to be *smeared* in the blood of the one slain bird *unmingled with any thing else*. And that *smearing*—for it could not possibly have been any thing more—is denoted by the word *bapto*. It follows, therefore, that *bapto*, as the Greeks used it, does not always signify immersion. We agree, with Dr. Fuller, that "nothing can be more explicit than this chapter;" but we must also say that his version of it is unauthorized by the word of God. To use his own language, "that he designed any perversion of God's word, we do not affirm. We assail nobody's sincerity; but his entire ignorance of the import of the chapter *is inexcusable*." Yet these are the sort of arguments by which he would justify himself and others in the excommunication of nearly all Christendom itself. Will he note this among his "morsels from the Baltimore Tracts"?

In Joshua iii. 15, we have this record:—"And as they that bare the ark were come unto Jordan, and the feet of the priests that bare the ark [*ebaphaesan*] *dipped* in the brim of the water, . . . the waters which came down from above stood and rose up upon a heap, . . . and the priests that bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord *stood firm on dry ground*." Here the mere touching of

the priests' feet "*in the brim*" of Jordan's outspread waters, and from which touch those waters instantly shrank away so as to leave "*dry ground*" from shore to shore, is denoted by *bapto*. Not even the shadow of immersion is contained in the passage, much less a *total* immersion.

Here, then, are clear and decisive instances of the use of *bapto* where the idea of submersion is foreign and excluded by the nature of things, and this *in Greek* the most closely related to that of the New Testament. We will give other instances to the same effect from classic usage.

In Arrian's History of Alexander the Great, we have this sentence:—"Nearchus relates that the Indians [*baptontai*] *dye* their beards." Certainly no one will undertake to say that these Indians *immersed* their beards.

In Ælian it is said of an old coxcomb that "he endeavored to conceal the hoariness of his hair by [*baphae*] *coloring* it." Did the old gentleman *immerse* his hair?

In Æschylus we have the sentence, "This garment, *stained* by the sword of Ægisthus." A sword certainly could not immerse a garment. A sword is not a fluid.

In Hippocrates we read, "when it *drops upon* the garments they [*baptetai*] *are dyed*." Dr. Fuller says that *bapto* means *to dye*, because dyeing is by immersion; but here we have the dyeing *by dropping*, and the Baptist labors in vain to get immersion into the passage.

Marcus Antoninus:—"The soul [*baptetai*] *is tinc-*

tured by the thoughts." Is the mind immersed by its thoughts?

Aristophanes speaks of Magnes as "imitating the Lydians, and writing Psanes, and [*baptomenos*] *smearing* himself with frog-colored paints." Did he *immerse* himself in these washes or paints?

Aristotle has the phrase, "but, being pressed, it [*baptai*] *stains* and colors the hands." Are we to understand that the juice of an article when pressed *in* the fist *immerses* the fist?

In a comic poem entitled "The Battle of the Frogs and the Mice," we have an account of the slaughter of one of the combatants; and the effect of his blood upon the lake, on the shore of which he fell, is denoted by *bapto*. We give Pope's translation:—

> "Gasping he rolls: a purple stream of blood
> *Distains* the surface of the silver flood."

Could a lake be *immersed*—totally immersed—in the blood of a dying frog or mouse? Hear Mr. Carson:—"To suppose there is here any extravagant allusion to the literal immersion or dipping of a lake is a monstrous perversion of taste." (So we would think.) "The lake is said to be *dyed, not dipped. There is in the word no reference to mode.* What a monstrous paradox in rhetoric is the figuring of the dipping of a lake in the blood of a mouse! Never was there such a figure. The lake is not said to be *dipped in blood*, but to be *dyed with* blood." (P. 48.) Very well said, and very much to our purpose. Here then, again, *bapto* can-

not mean immersion, but signifies simply to tinge or color slightly, without reference to mode.

There is also an instance in Hippocrates where *bapto* is used with *epi, upon.* And, as it is sheer nonsense to talk of *immersing upon, bapto* from this must needs have in it a signification to embrace the application of the element to the subject without immersion.

We give but one other instance from the classics. Herodotus says, "The Egyptians consider the swine so polluted a beast, that, if any one in passing touch a swine, he will go away and *wash* himself with his very garments." Here is *bapto* employed to denote *a religious washing* for the purpose of cleansing from a defiling touch. What more can we need? All these instances present *bapto* completely stripped of every vestige of that mere modal signification which Dr. Fuller tells us it always has.

Add yet a quotation or two from the New Testament itself.

In Matthew xxvi. 23, the Savior says, "He that [*embapsas*] *dippeth* his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." Suppose that the Savior and his disciples had before them a large vessel filled with liquid food,—for, if it was not liquid, all possibility of immersion is excluded: are we to be told that he and Judas both together, in the ordinary course of taking a meal, totally *immersed their hands in it?* The idea is preposterous. Here, then, *bapto* does not mean to immerse; and Dr. Fuller's theory has another contradiction from the lips of Christ himself.

In Revelation xix. 13, John says of Him who is faithful and true, "And he was clothed with a vesture [*bebammenon*] *dipped* in blood." The figure is that of a conqueror from the field of battle, with his clothing *stained* with the blood of his slain foes. The allusion is plainly to Isa. lxiii. 2, 3:—"Wherefore art thou *red* in thine apparel, and thy garments *like him that treadeth in the wine-fat?* I have trodden the wine-press alone; and of the people there was none with me; for I will tread them in mine anger, and trample them in my fury, *and their blood shall be* SPRINKLED UPON MY GARMENTS, *and I will* STAIN *all my raiment.*" It is a remarkable and overwhelming fact in this connection that the two oldest and best translations of the Apocalypse—the Syriac and Ethiopic versions—render this *bebammenon* by terms denoting *sprinkling.* Wickliffe translates it *spreynt*, or sprinkled. The Rheims version does the same. And so Origen, himself a Greek, when citing this passage, gives *errantismenon*, which means SPRINKLED, as the equivalent of *bapto* as here used. Does not this settle the question?

Now, with this half a score of lexicographers, and this list of authorities, with the most learned of the Baptist critics at its head, and these numerous instances, all testifying that *bapto* may be used without respect to mode, who can resist the conviction that it does not mean simply to *immerse* and nothing else?

According to Hedericus, Ursinus, Scapula, Schrevelius, Donnegan, Dunbar, Grove, Watson,

and Herodotus, it means *to wash*,—simply to wash.

According to Hedericus, Coulon, Ursinus, Scapula, Schrevelius, Donnegan, Pickering, Liddell and Scott, Dunbar, Grove, *Carson*, Watson, Wilson, and others whom we have quoted, it means *to stain and dye*, even where the process is by *dropping*, *pressing*, *smearing*, and even, as in the case of the hair, by *rubbing*.

According to Gases, Grove, Watson, the Septuagint version of Daniel, and Æschylus, it means *to moisten*, *wet*, or *bedew*, as by the distillation of the dews of the night, or by the flowing of blood upon the garments from wounds.

And, according to Ursinus, Grove, Watson, Hippocrates, the Syriac and Ethiopic versions of the Apocalypse, and even Origen, it means TO BESPRINKLE; whilst Hedericus, Scapula, and Schrevelius also render it by *lavo*, which includes *sprinkling* and *pouring*, as well as any other application of water.

He who can resist such evidence can resist demonstration itself. Our case, therefore, as respects *bapto*, is made out. Our statement that it means to wash, cleanse, wet, moisten, bedew, stain, tinge, and dye, without regard to mode, and even to *besprinkle*, stands verified, firm, and immovable.

BAPTO DOES NOT MEAN MERE MODE,—to immerse and nothing else.

CHAPTER IV.

THE ADDITION OF "ZO."

THE next step in our progress to ascertain the meaning of *baptizo* will be to examine the force of the termination of *zo*, or *izo*, when added to a primitive word.

Upon this little particle there has been much said, and contradictory theories have been broached.

Mr. Campbell takes the ground that the addition of *zo* does not alter the sense of the primitive word to which it is affixed, but "indicates *the rapidity* with which the action is to be performed." If this be a true position, *baptizo* (that is, *bapto* with the addition of *zo*) would signify a more rapid, and, consequently, only a more superficial, washing, cleansing, wetting, or sprinkling than that indicated by *bapto*.

Others have thought that all verbs ending in *zo* are to be taken as *frequentative*, indicating that the action is to be successively repeated. But this theory meets with but little favor even with Baptist critics.

An extensively-received opinion is that verbs ending in *zo* are precisely of the same power and signification with the primitives from which they

are formed, and that *zo* or *izo* is added only for the sake of euphony. Thus, *pnigo* and *pnigizo* both mean to strangle or choke; *euoreo* and *euoriazo*, both, to be careless or unconcerned; *biao* and *biazo*, both, to force or compel. Hence, Dr. Gale, one of the most learned Baptist authors, takes *bapto* and *baptizo* as "exactly the same as to signification," and holds it perfectly warrantable to argue "promiscuously from both." Mr. Carson says to this, "As far as respects an increase or diminution of the action of the verb, *I perfectly agree with the writer*. That one is more or less than the other, as to *mode or frequency*, is a perfectly groundless conceit." (P. 19.) And Mr. Campbell, notwithstanding his doctrine of rapidity, agrees that "a change on the end of a word, when agreeable to the ear, soon loses its meaning by being extended to many words, for the sake of euphony. So of the termination *zo*." If, then, we are to adopt this theory, *baptizo* means simply to wash, cleanse, wet, stain, sprinkle, &c., the same as *bapto*.

But all this does not avail for Dr. Fuller. He must have a new theory; and a remarkable compound it is. "In the Greek language," says he, "the addition of *zo* rather enforces the primitive verb. It imparts a peculiar significancy, and seems generally to denote the transferring to another, or performing upon another, the thing designated. Thus,—*bapto*, to dip; *baptizo*, to make one dip; that is, to immerse"! A clever bid, this, for Mr. Carson's premium for nonsense. *Zo* enforces the primitive verb, and transfers it to another! and performs it upon another!! and

completes it in "immersion and nothing else"! Surely this *zo* is a wonderful particle in Dr. Fuller's estimation. But see his illustrations. "*Zo* rather enforces, transfers, performs upon another, the primitive *verb;* thus,—*sophos,* wise; *sophizo,* to make wise." *Sophos* a *verb!* enforced, transferred, performed upon another, by the addition of *zo!!* What an interpreter to show the meaning of a Greek word which, as he teaches, involves the Christian character and eternal hopes of all Christendom itself! *Sophos* is an *adjective,* which admits of no performance, (at least in this instance it has not been performed upon the doctor,) whilst *bapto* and *baptizo* are both *verbs.* The analogy which he is aiming at, to be complete, must therefore be confined to verbs. But whether we take radical verbs and their derivatives, or take nouns, adjectives, or any other parts of speech, and the verbs ending in *zo* derived from or related to them, we shall find no foundation for the mysterious force which the doctor is pleased to assign to the affix of *zo,* concerning which he modestly tells us that great "authors only betray their innocence of the Greek language"!

Let us look at a few cases:—

1. Nouns:—*phos,* light; *photizo,* to enlighten, or put in process of becoming illuminated: *eunouchos,* a eunuch; *eunouchizo,* to make a eunuch, or to put in process of becoming a eunuch: *gunæ,* genitive *gunaikos,* a woman; *gunaikizo,* to render womanish, or to put in process of becoming like a woman: *doxa,* glory; *doxazo,* to glorify, or put in process of becoming glorious: *paraskeua,* a state of pre-

paration; *paraskeuazo*, to make preparation, or to put in process of becoming prepared.

2. Adjectives:—*katharos*, clean; *katharizo*, to cleanse, or put in process of becoming clean or pure: *phoinios*, red as blood; *phoinizo*, to redden, or put in process of becoming red.

3. Verbs, (and here the cases are perfectly analogous to *bapto*, *baptizo*:)—*melaneo*, to be black; *melanizo*, to be blackish, or in a condition verging towards black: *plouteo*, to be rich; *ploutizo*, to enrich, or put in process of becoming rich: *deipneo*, to sup; *deipnizo*, to make ready to sup: *phluo*, to overflow, as boiling water escaping from a kettle; *phluzo*, to bubble up so as to tend towards an overflow.

From these examples, and many others that might easily be given, it would appear that the addition of *zo* or *izo* in Greek corresponds to our English terminations *ize* and *ish*, which have most likely taken their origin from it; as, *fertile, fertilize; blue, bluish*, &c. If so, then *zo* has only a preparative relation to the primitive word to which it is affixed, and indicates a diminution of its force. That which is blackish is not yet black. He who is being enriched is not yet rich. The preparation for a supper is not yet supping. The water that bubbles up as if it would overflow is not necessarily overflowing. He who is rendered womanish is not yet a woman. So then *baptizo* is not quite a *bapto*, but only something approximating to it.

But we must not forget Dr. Fuller's examples:—"*Oikeo*, to dwell; *oikizo*, to make one dwell. *So-*

phos, wise; *sophizo,* to make wise. *Sophroneo,* to be of a sound mind; *sophronizo,* to make one of a sound mind. And, just so, *bapto,* to dip; *baptizo,* to make one dip,—that is, to immerse."

It would be interesting to know how the phrase "*to make one dip*" can be taken here as synonymous with the word "*immerse.*" If Dr. Fuller's theory concerning *zo* means any thing, it assigns it a causative force the stress of which falls upon the actor and not upon the subject. "To make one dip" is to cause one to do a dipping. It sets one to the performance of the act, but it does not intensify the dipping, or transmute it into an immersion.

It is also a matter of reasonable curiosity where Dr. Fuller obtained the significations which he assigns to the words he gives as his illustrations. If the reader will open some standard Greek lexicon, he will find that *oikeo* means to inhabit, and *oikizo,* to render habitable, or to put in process of becoming inhabited. *Sophos* means skilful; *sophizo,* to render skilful, or to put in process of becoming skilful. *Sophroneo* means to be of a sound mind, prudent, or discreet; *sophronizo,* to render prudent, or to put in process (as by chastisement and training) of becoming prudent or discreet. Why, the doctor's own examples confute him! In every instance which he has produced the verb with *zo* affixed falls short of what is denoted by the primitive word,—at any rate, does not exceed it.

But, says Dr. Fuller, "Dr. Porson, *the first Greek scholar England has ever produced,* regarded bap-

tizo as more emphatical than bapto," (p. 13.) Now, England had Greek scholars before she had Dr. Porson, though she may never have had any superior to him in Greek learning. But how does Dr. Fuller know that such was Porson's opinion? Not from any thing which that noted scholar has written; but from an obscure tradition that he once said so, and that tradition given by an author who mentions it only to question it! The account is, that a certain Mr. Newman accompanied an acquaintance in a friendly call upon Dr. Porson just a few months before his death; that something was said in that interview about Greek; that Mr. Newman, after Dr. Porson's death, wrote a letter to some unknown individual, which letter, in some unknown way, was put into the hands of Mr. Carson, who speaks of it in his book on baptism, whence Dr. Fuller derived it; and that it is said, in said letter, that Dr. Porson said, "if there be a difference [between *baptizo* and *bapto*] he should take the former to be the strongest." This is the whole story. Of what account is it? Not a judge in the land would admit it as evidence even in a cause involving no more than dollars and cents; and shall it be admitted on a question involving eternal consequences? However, if Dr. Fuller's case needs it, let him have it. It is enough for us that Mr. Carson, from whom he gets it, views it with suspicion, disputes the position which it is now quoted to sustain, and lays down the doctrine in its very face that "*the derivative cannot go beyond its primitive*," (p. 23.) At best, the alleged opinion of Porson is given hypotheti-

cally. He says, "If there be a difference." The very language intimates doubt as to whether *baptizo* does not mean just the same as *bapto*. And, if Dr. Porson could not satisfy himself of any "peculiar significancy" in *zo*, we need fear nothing disastrous to our argument from that quarter.

But if Dr. Fuller's theory concerning *zo*, as he has defined it, were even true, it can prove nothing to fix immersion upon *baptizo* as its exclusive meaning. He says that it "enforces," "transfers," "performs upon another," what the primitive verb signifies. The meaning must therefore, on his own showing, be *in* the primitive verb before in can be transferred or enforced; and it must enforce and transfer at the same time the whole meaning of the primitive verb. If the primitive verb means *to sprinkle* as well as *dip, to wash, wet, moisten,* and *bedew* as well as to *immerse,* the addition of *zo* must perform the same office for the one as for the other. All this is plain and clear, although Dr. Fuller does not seem to have observed it.

Now, we have shown from the Septuagint version of Daniel that there is a *bapto* which signifies the gentle moistening of an exposed body by the falling dew. We have shown from the same version of Leviticus that there is a *bapto* which denotes the smearing of a living bird, scarlet, and hyssop in the blood of one bird. We have shown from Arrian and Ælian that there is a *bapto* which designates the coloring of the hair. We have shown from Æschylus and Hippocrates that there is a *bapto* which expresses the staining of a gar-

ment by oozing blood or a dropping liquid. We have shown from the poem ascribed to Homer that there is a *bapto* which signifies the slight tinging of a lake by the blood of a frog or mouse; and we have shown from the Apocalypse that there is a *bapto* which denotes the blood-stains upon the garments of a conquering warrior. We have also produced a half-score of the best lexicographers and the statements of other learned men, and the admission of Carson himself, in support of the fact that these are, and have been for ages, among the accepted and acknowledged significations of *bapto*. Let Dr. Fuller, then, apply *zos* by the cart-load, and transfer, enforce, and perform upon another what is expressed in the primitive verb, until the day of doom, still *baptizo* refuses to be tied down to "immersion and nothing else."

And when we come to apply what is further in evidence,—that there are multitudes of Greek verbs ending in *zo* which denote acts or conditions only slightly tending or imperfectly approximating to the thing expressed in the primitive word,—the case becomes inevitable and certain that there is nothing in the mere addition of *zo* to confine the import of *baptizo* exclusively to immersion.

Let the reader now cast his thoughts back over the ground which we have traversed, and ask himself whether he can find room for the feeblest probability that Christ's command to baptize is "a command to immerse and nothing else"? Having complied with this request, and answered

this question, the way is open to pursue our doctor's "argument,"—

> "the rarest argument of wonder
> That hath shot out in our later times."

CHAPTER V.

THE QUESTION OF DIVERS SIGNIFICATIONS.

For all that we have thus far learned, the word *baptizo,* which is the word in dispute in this controversy, so far from meaning total immersion and nothing else, means also to wash, cleanse, wet, moisten, bedew, and even to sprinkle. We have established all these meanings of *bapto.* We have shown that there is nothing in the addition of *zo* or *izo* to augment these meanings We have also shown that there are many Greek verbs, of which *baptizo* may be one, which are so modified, limited, and diminished by the addition of *zo* as to indicate an act or condition only approximating to that signified in the primitive word. It hence follows that *baptizo* means about the same as *bapto;* that, as *bapto* means to wash, cleanse, wet, moisten, and bedew, so *baptizo* means to wash, cleanse, wet, moisten, and bedew, or something approximative to what these words import.

But Dr. Fuller insists that *baptizo* certainly does mean immersion, and that *a word cannot have more*

than one meaning. "The assertion," says he, "that *baptizo* has three different meanings only proves how strangely controversy can blind the mind to the plainest things. To say that a word means three distinct things is to say that it means neither of them. And this is true of the most general words. The puerilities of which men are guilty on this plain matter are surprising." (P. 14.)

A "plain matter" it certainly is; and how any sane, fair man can thus contradict so plain a matter as that a word may have more than one signification, we cannot understand. Dr. Fuller knows—he must know—he cannot read ten lines in any dictionary in any language without having the testimony before him—that there are words every one of which has various shades of signification and very different meanings. He has told us that "no one ought to substitute for proof his own assertion." And yet we have here, as an essential link in his "argument," nothing but assertion,—assertion unaccompanied with the merest shadow of proof, and as far from truth as heaven is from earth. It seems like pedantry and puerility to reply to an error so palpable and egregious as that which he has here broached. But we are sometimes called on to prove that two and two make four. We will therefore proceed to show by abundant evidence that it is one of the commonest things in language for a word to be used in different and even opposite meanings.

We have before us a book by Roget, called "*Thesaurus of English Words,*" edited by Dr. Barnas Sears, who commends it as "justly held in

high estimation both in England and America." In this book, Roget says, "The most cursory glance over the pages of a dictionary will show that *a great number of words are used in various senses*, sometimes distinguished by slight shades of difference, but *often diverging widely* from their primary signification, and even, in some cases, bearing no perceptible relation. It may even happen that the very same word has two significations quite opposite to one another." (P. 23.) This author refers for examples to such words as *impugn*, which sometimes means to assail and sometimes to defend; *ravel*, sometimes to entangle, sometimes to disentangle; *priceless*, invaluable, or of no value; *nervous*, strong, or at other times weak or feeble. Professor Stuart's translation of Ernesti says that "usage has gradually assigned *many meanings to the same word.*" And Professor Curtis, a Baptist, in his recent book in favor of "Baptist principles," says, "*Almost every word has several significations,*" (p. 145.) And all this is true of words in all languages.

In Hebrew, *bara* means to create, to fatten, and to cut off,—three different significations; and *barak* means both to bless and to curse.

In Greek, *lego* means to speak, to choose, to reckon up, and to lie down to rest,—at least three unrelated things; *eirgo* means both to *include* and to *excludè;* and *ballo*, according to Schrevelius, has seventeen meanings.

In Arabic, *faraka* means to separate, withdraw, lay open, cast out, immerse,—not less than four things.

The Russian word *uberayu* means to put in order, mow, reap, and to dress the hair,—three or more different significations.

The Chaldee word *barak* means to bless, salute, bend the knee, dig, plow, and to set slips for propagation,—certainly very diverse operations.

The Italian word *parare* means to prepare, garnish, parry, repair, and to stop a horse,—five significations.

The Dutch word *heeten* means to heat, to name, and to command,—certainly very different things.

The German word *vermessen* means to measure, to measure wrong, to dare, to arrogate, to swear or protest with solemn asseverations, and to profess with high and boasting words. What diversity of import!

The Spanish word *parar* means to prepare, to stop, detain, prevent, to end, to treat or use ill, and to stake at cards,—at least five diverse things.

The Latin *curo* means to take care of, to provide, to refresh one's self with meat, to cook meat, to bring to pass, to command, to pay homage to, to cure, to expiate or atone. What variety!

In French, *tirer* means to draw, to free or rid from, to reap, to deduce, to extract, to stretch, and to shoot; and *louer* means to hire, to lease, to praise, to applaud,—all things very different.

And in English *spring* means a leap, a part of a watch, one of the seasons, and a fountain of water,—four wholly different things; *cleave* means to adhere and to divide; and Webster assigns to the word *turn* thirty transitive and twenty intransitive significations!

Multitudes of other words, with similar diversity of signification belonging to each, might be produced with the greatest ease. And yet, according to Dr. Fuller, it is "puerility" and "folly" to assert that a word can have more than one meaning! Wondrous linguistic philosopher! Is it not amazing that any one should be so blind and reckless "in a matter of so much moment as obedience to Jesus Christ"? No, no, Dr. Fuller; whatever may be your *à priori* impressions, and however much your cause may demand your extraordinary announcement to the contrary, words *may and do* have various and even opposite meanings. By denying this, you make war upon the plainest truth, contradict the sternest facts, and put yourself in a position before the world which calls for pity. And, if it is on this that you rely to confine the meaning of *baptizo* to total immersion, your cause is gone beyond recovery.

But this is not the end of our doctor's trimming up of all words to one signification. He had some words before him, when he wrote this part of his book, which so palpably mean different things, that he must needs resort to some further and equally extraordinary invention to meet the difficulty. "We are referred," says he, "to the word *spring*, as meaning a leap, and a part of a watch, and one of the seasons, and a fountain of water. A schoolboy, however, sees that *these are different words, though similarly spelt*." (P. 14.) Hear, ye sages, and learn wisdom! Words "similarly spelt," composed of exactly the same letters, pronounced the same, belonging to the same language,

identical in every mark they bear, yet altogether "different," and "a schoolboy sees it"!! Sameness, then, is no more sameness; and the four words *spring, spring, spring,* and *spring* are hardly to be recognized any more as members of the same family, much less to be confounded as one, if ever we would understand the commands of Jesus, or be sure that we have obeyed them! But, as our author remarks, it "only proves how strangely controversy can blind the mind to the plainest things."

Suppose, however, that it were true, that words orthographically alike are different words: will that fix immersion as the meaning of the *baptizo* used in the Savior's command? Not at all. It only places the question one remove further back. Admit that Dr. Fuller is right in this particular, it then devolves upon him to prove that this is the *baptizo* which means to immerse, and not one of those other *baptizos* which mean to wash, cleanse, purify, wet, moisten, and bedew. Does he prove this? No. Does he attempt to prove it? No. All he has to say upon the subject is, "a schoolboy sees it;" when it is certain that no school*boy* or school*man*, from the time of the institution of schools, ever did or ever will see it.

Thus far, then, our position remains firm, that *baptizo,* as *bapto,* so far from meaning immersion only, means also *to wash cleanse, wet, moisten, bedew.*

CHAPTER VI.

BAPTIZO—THE LEXICONS.

We come now to the word *baptizo* itself. Mr. Carson maintains that "it always signifies to dip,—never expressing any thing but mode." Dr. Fuller takes much the same ground. "*Baptizo,*" says he, "always denotes a total immersion. . . . The word, I repeat it, means nothing but immerse. . . . The word *baptizo* has but one meaning, *and always signifies immerse.*" (Pp. 19, 45.) This is the common Baptist doctrine from Dan to Beersheba. If this fails, one great branch of their system—the right arm of their strength—is gone.

We have already done something towards ascertaining what is the real meaning of *baptizo.* It has been shown that *bapto* means *washing, cleansing, wetting, and moistening,* as well as immersion; that the addition of *zo* or *izo* cannot augment, but rather diminishes, the import of the word to which it is affixed; and hence that *bapto* with *zo,* or *baptizo,* must also mean to *wet, wash, cleanse, and moisten,* whether by the application of the object to the element or by the application of the element to the object. The reader is therefore in a position to anticipate what we are about to bring forward in the sequel. We now engage to pr-

duce proof upon proof, the clearest and the most invincible, and to show and establish, against Mr. Carson, Dr. Fuller, Mr. Campbell, and the whole tribe of Baptists, that such is the true scope and meaning of the word *baptizo*.

Our first appeal is to *the lexicographers*.

It is a little surprising that Dr. Fuller has wholly omitted and studiously avoided this source of testimony. Campbell concedes that the lexicographers are "the most learned and most competent witnesses in the case in the world." And it is evident, upon the very first thought, that such is the fact. The only reason we can see why Dr. Fuller has so strangely passed by these "most competent witnesses in the world" is, that he felt his cause in peril and hopeless in case their testimony should be taken. Though he has not said in words, he has said in the manner in which he has conducted his argument, as his great light of Tubbermore said before him, "*I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me.*"* (See Carson on Baptism, p. 55.) And yet Carson admits "that *lexicons are an authority.* Indeed," says he, "I should consider it the most unreasonable skepti-

* Dr. Fuller says (p. 18) that people garble and misrepresent Carson's language when they so quote him. We therefore give the entire passage, that our readers may judge for themselves. Carson says, "My position is, that baptizo always signifies to dip,—never expressing any thing but mode. *Now, as I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion,* it will be necessary to say a word or two with respect to the authority of lexicons. Many will be startled at the idea of *refusing to submit to the unanimous authority of lexicons,* as an instance of the basest skepticism."

cism to deny that a word has a meaning which all lexicons give as a primary meaning," (p. 56.) But, if it is "unreasonable skepticism" to rule out the testimony of lexicographers on one meaning of a word, how can it be less reprehensible to rule out their testimony as to other meanings? We must take their whole testimony or none; else we contradict one of the plainest laws of evidence, which Dr. Fuller can hardly be supposed to have forgotten. We certainly do most strenuously protest against this partial and unwarrantable dealing with "the most competent witnesses in the world" upon a matter so momentous as obedience to Christ. We therefore proceed to take the testimony of the lexicographers.

The first we produce is *Scapula*, who published his Greek Lexicon almost three hundred years ago. He defines "*baptizo*, mergo, seu immergo; item submergo, obruo aqua; item abluo, lavo, (Mark vii., Luke xi.;)" which, being interpreted, means "to dip, or to immerse; also to submerge, to overwhelm with water; *also, to cleanse, to wash.*" He also defines *baptismos*, mersio, lotio, ablutio,—"dipping, *washing, cleansing.*"

2. *Henry Stephens*, (died 1598,) pronounced one of the best Grecians of his time, defines "*baptizo*, mergo, seu immergo, submergo, obruo aqua; abluo, lavo;" to dip, or immerse, submerge, overwhelm with water; *to cleanse, to wash.*

3. *Cornelius Schrevelius*, a laborious critic, (died 1667,) defines "*baptizo*, mergo, abluo, lavo;" to dip, *to cleanse, to wash.*

4. *Robertson's Thesaurus*, one of the most accu-

rate of dictionaries, printed 1676, defines *baptizo* by only two words, *mergo* and *lavo; to dip, to wash.*

5. *John G. Suicer,* in his Thesaurus, published 1683, defines "*baptizo,* mergo, immergo, submergo, aqua obruo; abluo, lavo;" to dip, immerse, submerge, overwhelm with water; *to cleanse, to wash.*

6. *Hedericus,* whose Lexicon was first published in 1722, gives "*baptizo,* mergo, immergo, aqua obruo; abluo, lavo; baptizo, significatu sacro;" to dip, immerse, overwhelm with water; *to cleanse, to wash;* to baptize *in a sacred sense.*

7. *Schœtgen,* in his Lexicon, 1765, gives "*baptizo,* mergo, immergo;" to dip, to immerse; "in Mark and Luke, abluo, lavo; largiter profundo;" *to cleanse, to wash;* to pour profusely upon.

8. *Bretschneider,* considered one of the most thorough critics on the New Testament, defines "*baptizo,* propriæ, sepius intingo, sepius lavo; deinde lavo, abluo simplicitur; medium, etc., lavo me, abluo me;" properly, often to dip into, *often to wash;* then *to wash, simply to cleanse;* in the middle voice, *I wash or cleanse myself.*

9. The Greek Clavis of *Stokius,* published more than one hundred years ago, defines "*baptizo,* proprie, est immergere ac intingere in aquam; tropice, per metalepsin, est lavire, abluere;" properly, it is to immerse or dip into water; tropically, by metalepsis, *to wash, to cleanse.* And, lest an improper impression should here be made by the circumstance that Stokius classes *wash* and *cleanse* among the tropical meanings of *baptizo,* we will simply refer to the fact that Ernesti states it as one of the commonest things in language for those meanings

of words which were originally only secondary and tropical to become the proper and best-understood meanings. And if we were to admit that, strictly and technically, *baptizo* only secondarily means to wash and cleanse, Mr. Carson is authority that secondary meanings "are as literal as the primary meaning," (p. 46,) and hence necessarily as much a part of the proper import of a word as any meaning can be.

10. *Schleusner*, a learned theologian and critic, gives "*baptizo*, proprie, immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo. In hoc autem significatione nunquam in Nov. Test., sed, abluo, lavo, aqua purgo;" properly, to immerse as to dye, to dip into water. *In this sense, however, it is never used in the New Testament, but in the sense to cleanse, to wash, to purify with water.*

11. *Parkhurst* enumerates dip and immerse among his definitions of *baptizo*, but, with Schleusner, holds that "in the New Testament it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included in *washing*." He defines it, "to immerse *or wash with water in token of purification*."

12. *Robinson* gives its classic use in the sense of dip, immerse, sink, &c.; but, as a New Testament word, he confines its meaning to *washing, cleansing*, bathing, and the performance of ablution.

13. *Ewing's Greek Lexicon* thus classifies its meanings:—"1. I plunge or sink completely under water. 2. I cover partially with water. 3. I overwhelm or cover with water by rushing, flowing, or pouring upon. 4. I drench or impregnate with liquor by affusion; I pour abundantly upon, so as

to wet thoroughly; I infuse. 5. I oppress or overwhelm by bringing burdens, afflictions, or distress upon. 6. *I wash, in general.* 7. *I wash for the special purpose of symbolical, ritual, or ceremonial purification.* 8. I administer the ordinance of Christian baptism; I baptize."

14. *Wahl* defines it, "FIRST, TO WASH, *to perform ablution, to cleanse;* SECONDLY, to immerse," &c.

15. *Greenfield* defines its scriptural signification, "*to wash,* to perform ablution, *cleanse,*" &c.

16. *Pickering* renders it, "to dip, to immerse, to sink, to overwhelm, *to wet, to wash, to cleanse.*"

17. *Dunbar,* "to dip, to immerse, to sink, to soak, to wash."

18. *Liddell and Scott,* "to dip repeatedly, to dip under, *to bathe, to wet,* TO POUR UPON, to drench, to overwhelm."

19. *Flacius,* (Clavis Scripturæ,) "immergo, abluo, lavo;" to immerse, *to cleanse, to wash.*

20. *Grove,* "to dip, immerse, *wash, cleanse, purify,* depress, humble, overwhelm, *to wash one's self,* to bathe."

It cannot be necessary to call any more witnesses of this class. We have others within reach; but twenty of the great masters of Greek lexicography, all unanimously testifying to precisely the same things, must be sufficient to settle the matter so far as respects the dictionaries.

Let us then endeavor to realize, digest, and bring fully before our minds what these witnesses have deposed.

In the first place, every man of them, from first to last, without the least faltering, hesitation, or

equivocation, declares and records *that the general signification of wetting, moistening, or washing, no matter how accomplished, is included in the word baptizo.* This is one point which stands out against the Baptist world like a continent against the sea. They may rave and labor and dash upon it with all their strength, but they can neither shake nor surmount it. There it is. No floods can destroy it. No hand can blot it out.

In the second place, six or eight of these witnesses clearly assert that, in the New Testament, the general signification of wetting, moistening, purifying, or washing, no matter how accomplished, is the most inherent, original, and primary meaning of *baptizo.* Here, again, is a mountain of strength for our cause.

In the third place, a number of these witnesses, including Robertson, Schrevelius, Bretschneider, do not give the distinctive idea of a total immersion as at all entering into the meaning of *baptizo.* Either, then, these men missed the meaning of this word altogether, or it means something else than a mere modal and entire immersion. There is no escape from this alternative.

In the fourth place, nearly one-half of those witnesses who give immersion as one of the significations of *baptizo* assign it only the second place, and give *dip* as a more literal and inherent meaning of this word. *Dip* may sometimes mean a total immersion, but this is not the burden of its import. Webster gives "to baptize by immersion" as its sixth and remotest signification. A sudden, quick, partial touching to a fluid is its most direct and

central meaning. A swallow sporting over a lake, and now and then touching his soft breast to its placid surface, *dips*, but is not immersed. A writer *dips* his pen in the ink, but he does not totally immerse it; he only touches the fluid with its extreme points. Nay, *dip* sometimes means simply to *wet* or *moisten*. Johnson and Webster both give these words as definitions of *dip*. Milton says,

> "a cold shuddering dew
> *Dips* me all over."

He meant, of course, nothing more than being moistened or wetted by the dew. Mr. Carson also agrees that it would be not only correct, but beautiful and elegant, to say of a man who had been caught in a shower of rain, he got a *dipping*, (p. 38.) And, if *mergo* and *dip* meant the same total modal immersion signified by *immergo* and *immerse*, it would be difficult to understand why these learned men should give these words as significant of a still further meaning. If *dip*, then, is the most inherent and original sense of *baptizo*, and if the main stress of the word *dip* runs on mere partial submersions, gentle or quick contacts with a fluid, wettings and moistenings as from dew or falling rain, we here spring a mine under the Baptist theory which carries it into absolute ruin.

In the fifth place, all those witnesses who speak of the specific New Testament or scriptural use of the word *baptizo* to a man give to it the general signification of wetting, washing, purifying, or cleansing, without regard to mode. Scapula refers to Mark and Luke, and gives it *abluo*, lavo,—to cleanse, to wash. Stephens follows with the same.

Bretschneider gives it, "often to dip, often to wash; then simply to wash, cleanse." Stokius gives the sacred sense to "wash and cleanse." Schleusner and Parkhurst say that it does not occur in the New Testament strictly in the sense of immerse, except so far as this is included in *washing*. Robinson gives its scriptural meaning, "to wash, to cleanse by washing." Flacius gives *abluo, lavo*,— to cleanse, to wash. And Ewing, Schœtgen, Greenfield, and all, take the same ground and state the same thing. Whatever, then, may be the meaning of this word in the old classic Greek authors, these men, with one accord, assert that *in the New Testament*, the only book we are concerned with in this controversy, it means to wash, cleanse, purify, *in any way*, without regard to the particular mode contended for by our Baptist friends.

We will yet call to the stand a few *native Greek* lexicographers to testify on this subject. These constitute a class of witnesses to whom Baptists are very fond of referring. They tell us that "the native Greeks must understand their own language better than foreigners;" and that "in this case the Greeks are *unexceptionable guides*." Dr. Fuller asks, "Is the Greek language now spoken by any nation? If it be, why not refer the point to them, *since they must know what is the meaning of the word?*" (P. 87.) Very well: we will go to the native Greeks, and agree to bind ourselves by the result. Will our Baptist friends be honest, and bind themselves to the decision of their "unexceptionable guides"? If not, let them cease their *palaver* about native Greeks.

1. The first of the native Greek lexicographers is *Hesychius,* who lived in the fourth century. He gives only *bapto,* in which he includes *baptizo;* and the word by which he defines its meaning is *antleo,* —*to draw,* or *pump,* or *pour out water.* This is his whole definition of *bapto* and its derivatives. Alas! what has become of "total immersion and nothing else"?

2. Next in order comes *Suidas,* a man whose mother-tongue was Greek, and who "must have known what is the meaning of the word." He lived in the ninth or tenth century. His definition of *baptizo* is given in the word *pluno,*—in Latin, *madefacio, lavo, abluo, purgo, mundo,—to wet, to lave, to wash, to cleanse, to purify.* Where is *dip, plunge, sink, immerse?*

3. But these are *old* writers: perhaps the present Greeks understand their own language better than their fathers. We descend, then, to the nineteenth century, at the beginning of which we find a large and complete lexicon, compiled with great labor and pains by the learned *Gases,* a native Greek, whose valuable work holds somewhat the same relation to the Greek language which Webster's Dictionary does to the language of the United States. "It is generally used by native Greeks," says Chapin. We turn to *baptizo,* and read his definition of it. It is in these words: *brecho, louo, antleo,—to wet, moisten, or bedew; to wash, lave, or bathe; to draw, pump, or pour out water.* This is the whole of it. NOT A WORD ABOUT DIP, IMMERSE, PLUNGE, OR SINK IS TO BE FOUND IN THE DEFINITION.

Our case, then, is made out. The native Greeks have spoken, and their words are all for us.

With such results following an examination of the lexicographers, we need not much wonder that Dr. Fuller so carefully avoided them in his book, or that Mr. Carson began to be troubled with fears of being charged with startling and base skepticism when he undertook to maintain that *baptizo* means nothing but a modal and total immersion. He did but utter the truth when he said, "I have all the lexicographers and commentators against me in this opinion."

But we have other and equally interesting details awaiting our attention.

CHAPTER VII.

BAPTIZO—THE CLASSICS.

The overwhelming odds against the theory of our Baptist friends, presented in our examinations thus far, may render the reader a little curious to know upon what they do rely in the much ado they make about immersion as the only baptism. The best of their critics admits that the best and most competent witnesses on this subject in the world—the lexicographers—are against them. But he denies that the lexicons are "an ultimate authority," and appeals from them to quotations from the Greek writers containing the word *baptizo*.

Quite a number of such quotations have been collected by the industry of writers on the subject, from which Dr. Fuller has culled a parcel which he presents as the foundation on which he rests for his doctrine concerning the meaning of the word in question. He says he takes them "*at random.*" Mr. Carson had said the same thing in presenting the same passages before. How many more have expressed themselves in the same way, over the same passages, we cannot say. But it is singular to see these studied insinuations that no great care has been exercised to bring out the utmost strength of the case. It seems to say that, after all their Greek explorations, these writers are by no means satisfied that they have made good their assertions. We shall see presently that their citations are "random" enough, especially when viewed as the last grand fortress upon which the fate of the Baptist theory is staked.

The observations which we have to make upon these cited passages are to this effect:—1. That, even as far as they go, they do not show *baptizo* in the one sense of "immerse and nothing else." 2. That, if they did, they would prove no more than that this is one of the acceptations in which this word has been used by certain writers. 3. That, if they were even competent to settle the classic Greek use of the word in question, they still cannot prove its import in the New Testament, which was not written in classic Greek; and, 4. That there are instances even of classic usage in which *baptizo* must be assigned a meaning at variance with the Baptist theory.

If we can make these points clear, we have taken the citadel in which the Baptists have lodged their strongest forces, and in which their greatest confidence reposes. Let us see, then, what is to be said.

I. Do the instances of the use of *baptizo*, to which Dr. Fuller refers, give to that word the uniform sense of total immersion? Do they sustain the idea that baptism is the application of the subject to the water? We say they do not.

In his first quotation, *baptizo* is used to denote the setting of the sun behind the western ocean. Is this a case of immersion? Then for the candidate to *pass behind* the cistern of baptismal water is as much an immersion as to go into the cistern and be covered up by the water in actual contact with his person. The sun surely never was in contact with the waters of the sea.

The second we once thought a case of genuine immersion, and so stated in the first edition of this book; but, having since seen the original, we are satisfied that the idea of immersion is not in the passage. Dr. Fuller gives only a translation, the same as that given by Carson, who borrowed it from Gale. This current Baptist version reads thus:—"When a piece of iron is taken red-hot from the fire, and is *dipped* (*baptized*) *in water*, the heat, being quenched by the peculiar nature of the water, ceases." This, to say the least, is a forced and incorrect translation; and that, too, in the very point in question. We have the original before us, and know what we are saying. The right trans-

lation is this:—"For a mass of iron, heated to redness, being drawn out by the smiths, *is baptized* WITH *water*, and that which was fiery by its own nature, being quenched WITH *water*, ceases to be so." "*Hudati baptizetai*" does not mean "*dipped in water*," as our Baptist doctors tell us. *Hudati* here is the dative of instrument, and can only be rendered, "WITH WATER." It is used twice in the same form in the same sentence, and can have no other translation. *Dipped* WITH *water, plunged* WITH *water*, is a syntax neither Greek nor English. Besides, "*a mass of iron*" which it required "*smiths*" —*more than one man*—to draw out of the fire, and that "*mass*" "heated to redness," was not a thing to be *dipped*, in the sense of the Baptists. It was baptized (*hudati*) WITH *water*, not INTO *water*. It was not *put in* a vessel filled with water, but water from a vessel was *put on it*. There was *pouring, throwing upon*, but no *dipping*. The water was *applied to the red-hot mass*, and not the red-hot mass applied to the water. It was *with* water, not *into* it. *Baptizo* here cannot be made to mean immersion at all. Yet these are the strong and decisive "instances" by which Baptists prove that "*baptizo* means to immerse and nothing else." With such liberties a man could prove any thing.

The next four, eleventh, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth, sixteenth, seventeenth, twenty-first, twenty-eighth, twenty-ninth, and thirtieth quotations give *baptizo* to denote the loss of vessels and men at sea by sinking to the bottom. There are other instances of the same kind. But if this is to be taken as the sense which Baptists attach

to the word, and it can have but the one exact meaning, then no man is *baptized* unless he is sunk to the bottom of the sea and kept there. The idea of *emersion*, or rising again, is here excluded from *baptizo*. Nay, Dr. Fuller boldly affirms in one place that "*baptizo* has nothing to do with the rising again." Then to baptize a man is simply to take him under the water, to the bottom of it, and to leave him there; and it is a violation of divine command to bring him up again. Christ commands only the *baptizing*, not the fishing up of what has been sunk; and, if *baptizo* has but one meaning, and that meaning is given in these quotations, Christ's command to baptize people is simply a command to sink them to the bottom of the sea,—to drown them!

In the sixth instance *baptizo* is employed to denote the dipping of a vessel in a fountain to take up water, or the filling of a vessel with water in a fountain. It is not necessarily or even probably a case of total immersion. It is not common in such an operation to submerge the entire vessel, hand, handle, and all.

In the next instance a crow is said to "baptize herself" by washing her head and breast upon the margin of a lake or stream. Most persons have seen this performance. It includes a slight dipping and splashing, but nothing like "a total immersion."

In the eighth, tenth, twenty-sixth, and forty-third instances *baptizo* is used to signify the act of drowning in the waves, or of causing one to sink into the waters so as to be drowned. But,

unless Christ's command to baptize is a command to sink beneath the surges so as to drown the subject, *baptizo* here and *baptizo* in the New Testament differ in signification.

In the ninth quotation *baptizo* is used to denote the dissolving of Cupid in wine in order to drink him. Are we to baptize people by making a drinkable solution of them?

In the twelfth instance *baptizo* denotes the sudden and furious *pouring forth of the waters* of the overflowing Nile, by which cattle are destroyed. Carson's version of the passage is, "Many of the land-animals, [*baptizomena*,] immersed *in the river*, perish." This rendering, as Wilson observes, "is grossly incorrect, inasmuch as the Greek says not one word about being immersed *in the river* or in any portion of water whatever. Dr. Carson's translation not only assumes quietly the point in debate, but invents for the Greek participle a construction which is not found in the original or necessarily suggested by the connection." The version given by Dr. Fuller is not quite so bad, but still conceals an important element in the idea of the author. The literal rendering is this:—"Many of the land-animals, overtaken by the river, perish, [*baptizomena*,] being baptized." Here we have clearly the river *coming upon* the animals, and not the animals thrust into the river. *Baptizo* in this passage will bear the sense of *overwhelm, pouring over*, but not the sense of dipping or immersing. It has in it here the idea of *mode;* and that mode is dashing or pouring upon.

The eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth in-

stances, which are taken from Strabo, give *baptizo* in the sense of sinking, or being sunk, very much as in the case of vessels lost at sea.

The twenty-second is from Plutarch:—"Baptize yourself in the sea, and, sitting down on the ground, remain all day." Dr. Fuller gives it, "*Plunge* yourself in the sea." But, if a man were to plunge himself into the sea, he would hardly find ground to sit on all day. The sense of *baptizo* in this passage plainly is *to wash*. It contains not a word about mode or immersion. *Wash* meets all the wants of the case, and also of the next respecting "the lake Copais." It is simply *washing*, with not the slightest reference to "plunging" or immersion.

The next case is a very remarkable one to be quoted in proof that *baptizo* means only total immersion. Speaking of a procession of marching soldiers, Plutarch says, "In this whole company there was not to be seen a buckler, a helmet, or spear, but, instead of them, cups, flagons, and goblets, *baptizing* from large vessels of wine, which the soldiers drank to each other, some as they marched along, and others seated at tables." Dr. Fuller says, "baptizing here means dipping." Perhaps it does, in the sense in which a man touches a cup into a fluid to take up for drinking. But, considering the circumstances under which the thing was done, and the nature of the vessels in which we would expect to find the wine carried with a moving army, we would rather say it means *drawing* in the sense of *pouring out into*.

Pliny, describing a bathing establishment, speaks

of two large basins projecting from the wall, which he says were "large enough [*innare*] to float in." He calls these basins *baptisteria*,—from which Dr. Fuller concludes that *baptizo* must mean immerse. Let him consult Potter's Antiquities, or Eschenburg's Manual, or Smith's Classical Dictionary, and he will find that "the word *baptisterium* is not a bath (Pliny does not so describe it) large enough to immerse the whole body, but a vessel or *labrum* containing cold water *for pouring over the head.*" If this quotation, therefore, proves any thing on this point, it proves that *baptizo* relates to the pouring of water or washing in general.

We are referred to yet a few other examples, in which *baptizo* is used to set forth the results of overstimulation, the stupefaction of men by drunkenness or sleep; as where it is said, "Bacchus *baptizes* one with sleep like that of death." But what can such instances prove as to mode? By a lively figure, we may say a man is immersed in wine; but it is equally rhetorical to speak of him as *drenched with* wine, overwhelmed with intoxication. There is simply the denotation of an effect. That effect is the induction of a state of stupefaction or insensibility. And the idea clearly involves the coming of the sleep upon the man more than the dipping or plunging of the man into the sleep.

These are the grand foundations upon which Dr. Fuller and his friends rely to prove that "*baptizo* means immerse and nothing else." Must they not be exceedingly in want, to lean upon

such testimony? The sun passes behind the seas, and it is said to be *baptized.* Water is thrown upon a mass of red-hot iron, and it is said to be *baptized.* A vessel is overwhelmed in the sea by the raging storm and dashing waves, or sunk to the bottom to rise no more, and it is said to be *baptized.* A man takes a vessel and dips up from a fountain, and that vessel is said to be *baptized.* A crow dips her head into the margin of a stream or lake and splashes herself with her wings, and she is said to *baptize* herself. A man is held down under the water until he drowns, and he is said to be *baptized.* A fancied creature is dissolved in wine, and it is called baptism. The Nile suddenly overflows and pours its waters out over the land and overwhelms certain animals, and they are said to be *baptized.* An individual sinks into a lake or into the mire of the sea, and he is said to be *baptized.* He washes himself, and he is *baptized* again. Marching soldiers draw or pour out wine as they move along in procession, and it is called *baptizing.* Pliny talks of large wash-basins projecting from the walls of a bath-house, and they are *baptizing-implements.* A drunkard is stupefied with rum, overwhelmed with intoxication, and he is *baptized* with the sleep of the debauchee. And this is to prove to us that baptism is a mere modal word, signifying immersion and nothing else! What a mind must he have who can agree to excommunicate—yea, and to damn—men upon such argumentation as this!

II. But, if these citations were in themselves all

that Baptists seem to think they are, they would be inadequate to settle the point at issue. Admit, for argument's sake, that in every instance adduced *baptizo* certainly means total immersion and nothing else: could that decide its meaning in the ten thousand other cases in which it has been used? Take a parallel case in the English language. The most ordinary thinker who reads at all can produce ten times as many instances to prove that the word "*let*" means simply *to permit.* But will that prove that the word *let* never means any thing but *to permit?* Certainly not; for we can demonstrate from Shakspeare and the English classics generally that *let* means *to hinder* as well as *to permit.* Again: we can give more instances than Dr. Fuller alleges on *baptizo* to prove that in the older English classics the word "*prevent*" was used only in the sense of *going before, preceding, taking the advance of.* But does that settle the meaning of *prevent* in modern English writing? Certainly not; for every one knows that *prevent* now means *to hinder, to stop, to intercept.* Suppose, then, that Dr. Fuller's quotations from the Greek authors do give the sense of total immersion to *baptizo,*—which we dispute: that proves only that immersion was with them a common meaning of this word. This no one denies; and it is useless—a work of supererogation—for our Baptist friends to be so voluminous in proof of a universally-admitted point. But let it be never so well established that in so and so many cases of classic usage *baptizo* signifies immersion: that does not and cannot go one jot to prove that it nowhere—

and especially not in New Testament Greek—means any thing but immersion.

Now, to prove that *baptizo* never has, anywhere, more than this one meaning of total immersion, is a much larger undertaking than our Baptist friends have imagined it to be. It is an attempt to prove a negative in a very wide field. It is venturing to deny a fact that has a very ample and unexplored range of probability in which to be verified. It is like undertaking to prove that there are no worlds in God's universe but those which astronomers have seen, or that no member of the human race bears the name of Beelzebub. To do the one, there must first be a complete exploration of creation up to where it joins upon nothingness; and to do the other, there must first be an actual ascertainment of what the name of every member of the race is. And so, when Dr. Fuller says, "I will prove the negative," and undertakes to show that *baptizo* never means any thing but immerse, he obligates himself to go through with a demonstration which must forever remain incomplete and unsatisfactory until he has shown, by actual ascertainment, what its exact signification is in every sentence in which it occurs in the whole round of Greek literature, whether classic or otherwise. So long as any part of the field remains unexplored, so long must there be a proportionate degree of doubt as to the correctness of any theory which a few known facts may seem to warrant. Has our friend, then, made any thing like a general, impartial, or adequate search into the *usus loquendi* of this word?

Has he seen and examined all the various passages in which it occurs? He certainly will make no such pretensions. From indications which we will not stop to point out, we are constrained to believe that he has not examined in their connections even the tenth part of the few passages which he has transferred to his pages. How ridiculous, then, for him to talk of having proven total immersion to be the specific and exclusive meaning of *baptizo!* And how utterly inadequate at best are a few classic quo ations to show that the writers of the New Testament, living in another age and country, reared under other influences, and laboring to set forth other ideas, must needs have used this word in this particular and no other sense!

III. That the Greek of the New Testament is not classic Greek is well known to every scholar. There was once a time when some men thought such an admission detracted from the character of the Sacred Writings, and attempted to establish the contrary. But all their efforts—some of which were very learned—have proven only grand failures. Let any one read Winer's Idioms of the Language of the New Testament, or even Professor Stuart's Grammar of the New Testament, or compare any good lexicon of the New Testament with the purely classic Greek lexicons, and he will be satisfied that the Greek of the New Testament has many lexical as well as grammatical deflections from the true Greek usage. To argue this point would take us too far for this brief treatise. We

will only quote a few of the prominent authorities on the subject.

Ernesti says, "We deny, without hesitation, that the diction of the New Testament is pure Greek. . . . In many passages there would arise an absurd and ridiculous meaning if they should be interpreted according to a pure Greek idiom." (Pp. 56, 57.)

Winer says, the Greek of the New Testament is "a Jewish Greek, which native Greeks generally did not understand, and therefore despised;" that "many Greek words are used by the New Testament writers with direct reference to the Christian system, as technical religious expressions; so that from this arises an element of diction peculiarly Christian;" and that "the New Testament contains many words not known to the written language of the Greeks, but introduced from the popular language, and even some newly formed." (Idioms, pp. 31, 36, 38.)

Dr. G. Campbell, a very high authority with Baptists, says that "classical use, both in Greek and in Latin, is not only in this study sometimes unavailing, but may even mislead. The *sacred* use and the *classical* are often very different." (On the Gospels, vol. i. p. 58.)

Davidson says, "It is almost superfluous to remark that the nature of the New Testament diction differs from the classical language of Greece. . . . When native Hebrews were commissioned to write about Christianity in the Greek tongue, they had ideas for which that tongue furnished no appropriate terms. . . . Hence it became necessary either

to employ words already existing in new senses, or to make entirely new ones. Both expedients were adopted." (Bibl. Crit. pp. 2, 5, 6.)

Diodati of Naples, who has written very learnedly and powerfully upon this subject, maintains that the language of Christ and the New Testament is "a Hellenistic dialect combining Greek words with a Hebrew phraseology." He calls it *hybrida lingua*, "a mongrel tongue, the main strain of which was Greek, but so completely made up of foreign admixtures, that, were all the contributions from various quarters removed, little would remain." (*Exercitatio de Christo Græce Loquente*, translated by Dobbin.)

Seiler, in his Biblical Hermeneutics, says, "There are many Greek words which among profane writers are used in a signification which, if not altogether different, is at least not precisely the same with that attached to them by the writers of the New Testament." (P. 379.) And it is just for this reason that Professor Stuart has remarked that "classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament."

Many testimonies to the same effect might be given from Heinsius, Vorst, Fisher, Leusden, Sturtzius, Plank, Hug, Robinson, and nearly all the prominent New Testament critics, from the days of Schleusner to the present. But it is useless to occupy space with authorities to prove what is so plain and obvious to every scholar. The reader may safely take it as settled forever that neither lexically nor grammatically is the Greek of

the New Testament the same as that of the classic Greek authors.

To whom, then, do our Baptist friends refer for examples to settle the New Testament sense of the word *baptizo?* Opening Dr. Fuller's book, we find the names of his authors ranging as follows:— Orpheus, Heraclides Ponticus, Polybius, the Greek Scholiasts on Euripides and Aratus, Alcibiades, Anacreon, Æsop, Diodorus Siculus, Plutarch, Pindar, Strabo, Epictetus, Lucian, Josephus, Philo,— *all classic Grecians, not one of whom can be ranked with that school of Greek writers to which the Greek of the New Testament belongs.* Though the last two were native Hebrews, they labored to write in the pure Grecian style. "As to the works of Josephus and Philo," says Davidson, "they afford less aid in explaining the New Testament, because they were able (and ambitious) to write in a style nearer that of the later Greeks than what appears in the New Testament." (Bibl. Crit. vol. ii. p. 7.) "Flavius Josephus," says Seiler, "labored to write elegant Greek, and to imitate the Greek profane authors." (Bibl. Herm. p. 373.) Without a single exception, then, all these authors are to be regarded as classic Grecians; and how can their manner of using a word settle the meaning of that word in *Hebraic Christian Greek*, which, according to Diodati, "differs from the pure Greek, both in style and phraseology, more than Bruttian from Tuscan, Gascon from Parisian, and Portuguese from Spanish"? The proposition is absurd. The idea is ridiculous. As well might we insist that the mongrel English of some German settlement

of Pennsylvania is to be interpreted by the dictionaries of Johnson, Webster, and Richardson.

Who will dare to deny that the New Testament employs terms which were familiar to the classics, to convey thoughts which never were attached to them by any writers anterior to the apostles or outside of the Church? He who does must maintain that the New Testament contains no thought, no meaning, which was unfamiliar to uninspired sages. And who has ever proven that *baptizo* is not one of those terms which have been brought over and accommodated to a sense peculiarly religious, and technically Christian? Scapula claims that it is one of the terms so accommodated. Schœtgen asserts the same. So also does Schleusner, and Parkhurst, and Robinson, and Ewing, and Winer, and Stuart, and Beecher, and Wilson, and many more who stand in the ranks of honored Biblical critics. To insist, then, upon interpreting *baptizo* in the New Testament by the classic use of this word, is to set up a principle most unreasonable in its nature, mischievous in its application, and repugnant to the deepest convictions of justice. But, if we *must* meet this unrighteous demand, and are compelled to go to the heathen Greeks to learn the Christian use of *baptizo*, we accept the challenge, and are not left without resource.

IV. We will show that even the classic Greeks did not always use this word in the sense of "immerse and nothing else."

The passage from Heraclides Ponticus, which is the second in Dr. Fuller's list, and upon which we

have commented, furnishes one instance to our purpose. The baptizing of a red-hot mass of iron *with water*, in this case, certainly was not an immersion. The phraseology, "*with water*," and the weight of the heated mass baptized, demonstrate that this baptism was performed by pouring and applying the water to the subject, and, hence, that *baptizo* here does not and cannot mean a total immersion.

Another example is in the Sibylline verse cited by Plutarch, and also referred to by Dr. Fuller as if it could be made to support his theory. The words are these,—speaking of the city of Athens: —"As a bladder thou mayest be *baptized;* but thou art not destined to sink." The plain meaning of this passage is, that the illustrious capital of Attica, though it might undergo grievous calamities and be repeatedly endangered in all its interests, was destined to survive its disasters and to be preserved from utter destruction,—just as a skin or bladder filled with air, and thrown upon the water, might be dashed by the waves, and often heavily sprinkled with their spray, (*baptized,*) but cannot be submerged by them. If *baptizo* means to sink, to go under the water, to be totally immersed, then this bladder could not be said to be baptized; for it is explicitly stated that it (*ou dunai esti*) SHOULD NOT GO UNDER, should not be submerged. But, whilst this bladder was not to *go under*, the classic author says that it might be *baptized.* In the sense of this writer, then, *baptizo* does not always mean to immerse. It means here *to sprinkle*, or *dash upon;* and that is all.

A third example is from Plutarch, where he says of a dying general, "He set up a trophy, on which, having *baptized* his hand in blood, he wrote." Dr. Fuller asks, upon this passage, "Did the general sprinkle or pour his hand?" We answer, No: *he baptized his hand.* But, as it now is our time to ask questions, we demand, Did he totally immerse his hand? If he did, tell us where he got the blood. He was dying of wounds; and it was doubtless his own blood that he used. But had it been carefully caught up in a basin in sufficient quantity to bury his whole hand in it? There is nothing to indicate such a thing; and to suppose it is absurd. How, then, did he totally immerse his hand? All the circumstances of the case give but one answer, and that is that *he did not immerse his entire hand.* He only took of his blood upon his fingers and wrote; and that taking of his blood upon his fingers is called *baptizing his hand.* According to this passage, then, again, *baptizo* does not mean total immersion and nothing else.

A fourth example is from the Life of Homer attributed to Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In the sixteenth book of the Iliad, the poet says of Ajax slaying Cleobulus, "He struck him on the neck with his hilted sword, *and the whole sword was warmed with blood;*" on which Dionysius remarks of Homer, "In this he expresses greater emphasis, as the sword being so *baptized* as to be even warmed." Gale and Carson interpret this baptism so as to make the sword "so *dipped in blood* as to be heated by it." At such laxity of paraphrase Dr. Halley is indignant, and says, "It is a false-

hood. To introduce the words 'dipped in blood' is as scandalous a misrepresentation as I have ever detected. There is not a word about dipping in blood in the original." But what shall then be said of Dr. Fuller's paraphrase, where he makes the passage mean "that the dagger pierced the throat, and *there*, being *immersed in blood*, became warm"? The sword certainly was rather *dipped* in blood than *immersed* in it. The plain meaning of the passage is this:—that Ajax struck his sword *on* the neck of Cleobulus, one of the results of which was that the blood flowed so copiously as to warm the whole sword. There was no dipping of the sword in blood. There was no entire burial of it in the neck of the sufferer and a leaving of it sticking there. It was simply a warming of the sword by the profuse gush of blood which attended the stroke. And that flow of the blood upon the sword of Ajax is called *the baptism* of it. We deny that it could have been a total immersion. We deny that it was a dipping; but Dionysius says it was a *baptism*. *Baptizo*, therefore, does not always mean a total immersion.

We have already submitted a few remarks upon the classic use of *baptizo* as connected with intoxication. We have still an observation or two to make upon that point. In all such cases the idea is evidently connected with *pouring upon* and *pouring into*, till mind and body are *overwhelmed, impregnated, intoxicated, drenched to stupefaction or destruction*. Thus, (Athen. Deipnos. lib. 5,) "to have been *baptized* [*too akratoo*] WITH STRONG WINE," does not mean to be dipped, plunged, immersed in

wine. The Greek has the dative of instrument, and requires the construction "*with wine.*" So also in the passage, "having made Alexander drunk [*baptized him*] *with wine*," and in other instances which we can give. Alexander was not put into the wine, but the wine was *put into him.* There was a *drenching, a pouring into, a saturation with,* but no dipping, no immersion. In all such passages, then, *baptizo* cannot mean total immersion and nothing else. And to these passages we may add the best of authorities.

Professor Wilson, of the Royal College, Belfast, has this remark:—"The assertion that *baptizo* denotes to dip, and only to dip, we hold to be utterly incapable of proof, by a full induction of the instances presented in the classical literature of Greece. On the contrary, the usage of philosophers, historians, and poets forces the admission of considerable latitude as to mere mode, by applying the term indiscriminately to the immersion of an object in the baptizing substance, and to the bringing of the baptizing substance upon and around an object." (P. 130.)

Greville Ewing, author of a Greek Grammar and a Greek-and-English Scripture Lexicon, says, "I distinctly deny that the Greeks have always understood the word baptism to signify dipping. . . . We are prepared to show that it signifies the application of water, or some other liquid, in any manner, or for any purpose: by effusion, affusion, perfusion, or infusion; by sprinkling, daubing, friction, or immersion; wholly or partially, permanently or for a moment; for purifying or

defiling, ornamenting or bespattering, washing away what was found adhering, or covering with what was not there before; for merely wetting the surface, or causing the liquor to sink into the inmost core."

Godwin says of fifty cases which he had collected of the use of *baptizo*, "there are only three where the construction is that required by the sense of dipping."

Dr. Beecher says of the classic use of *baptizo*, "I freely admit that in numerous cases it clearly denotes to immerse,—in which case an agent submerges partially or totally some person or thing. It is also applied to cases where a fluid without an agent rolls over or floods and covers any thing. It is also applied in cases where some person or thing sinks passively into the flood. I am aware that by some writers vigorous efforts are made to reduce all these senses to the original idea to immerse or dip. But it seems to me that they are rather led by their zeal to support a theory, than by a careful induction from facts; and that they wrest facts to suit their principles, rather than derive their principles from facts."

Dr. John Cumming says, "In profane writers, *bapto* and *baptizo* are unquestionably used both in the sense of dipping and pouring or sprinkling."

Now, what more can any reasonable man want? We have shown that the examples adduced and relied on by Baptists give *baptizo* in other senses than that of simple dipping or immersion; that, if they even proved immersion to be the clear import of this word so far as respects these passages them-

selves, it would prove nothing as to its meaning in other places and writers; that, at best, classic Greek, from which these quotations are taken, is an unsafe and dangerous guide for the interpretation of the Hebraic Christian Greek of the New Testament; nay, more: that, even in the classics, *baptizo* is often used where the idea of dipping and immersion is foreign, improbable, and impossible. And if this is not enough to neutralize and demolish the force of all that can be brought from the classics to decide the meaning of Christ's command, there is no strength in logic and no power in truth.

What, then, does this part of Dr. Fuller's argument, upon which he has staked so much, amount to? It proves that in some cases the classic use of *baptizo* denotes the act of dipping, submerging, overflowing, sinking, drenching, overwhelming; and this is all it proves. And, as to this, he might have saved his pains, for we have never yet found any one to deny it. We admit it without hesitation. But we do most peremptorily deny that the classics always use *baptizo* in this sense, or that our admission is worth a farthing to prove that this is its meaning in the New Testament.

Greville Ewing says, "I have not been able to meet with an instance of *immersion-baptism* in the Holy Scriptures." When we come to that department of this inquiry, we shall show that no such instance can be found. But we must first dispose of some other points.

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTIZO—THE AUTHORITIES.

To his citations from the classics Dr. Fuller adds a number of authorities, about the same that are found in nearly every Baptist publication on this controversy. Alleged quotations are given from Calvin, Luther, Beza, Vitringa, Hospinian, Gutlerus, Buddeus, Salmasius, Venema, Fritzeche, Augusti, Brenner, Bretschneider, Paulus, Rheinhard, Scholz, Lange, and Anthon, to prove—*what?* what nobody denies—that *baptizo* does mean immerse. But what is the use of being so wonderfully erudite upon points where there is no dispute? It seems to be a settled part of Baptist logic to accumulate authorities upon things in which we all agree, in order, by an adroit *petitio principii*, to make it appear that they have triumphantly proven what they have not yet begun to prove. The point is not whether *baptizo* means immerse, but *whether this is its specific, uniform, and only meaning.* The one we admit; the other we deny. Especially in classic Greek is *baptizo* used to denote sinking, dipping, plunging, overwhelming, destroying by water; and we can give stronger instances of this than the great mass of those given by Dr. Fuller. But we would surrender

some of our clearest convictions of truth, to admit for one moment that it is never used in other senses, or that immerse and nothing else is its meaning in the New Testament. We also deny that these authors referred to by Dr. Fuller ever meant to say that immerse is the only meaning of *baptizo*, or that this is at all its sense in the Scriptures.

Calvin is quoted; but Calvin says, "Whether the person who is baptized be wholly immersed, and whether thrice or once, or *whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance.*" (Inst. lib. 4, ch. 15, sec. 19.)

Luther is quoted. We would ask, Was Luther an honest man? Will any one charge him with being too great a coward to declare his convictions or to do what he believed to be right? If he then really believed that baptism in the New Testament means immersion and nothing else, what is the reason that he never immersed any one, and that he never was immersed himself? He agreed that immerse is a common meaning of *baptizo;* but he also claimed that its New Testament import was exhausted, or, at least, adequately met, by the sprinkling, pouring, or applying "*a mere handful of water*" upon the candidate. He speaks of "dipping a child in water, *or sprinkling it with water,*" as "according with the command of Christ." He refers to baptism as involving no parade or display, and says that therein "*God outwardly does no more than apply a handful of water.*" Again, he says of baptism, "God has commanded that we use our hand and tongue in administering

it, *by sprinkling water upon the subject* in connection with the words which he has prescribed." Again, he says, "*All that is essential to baptism is the use of natural water in connection with the words of the institution.*" Nay, he has himself given us a version of the New Testament, in which he translates *baptizo* four times by the general word *waschen, to wash,* and construes it elsewhere several times with the preposition *with* [*mit*],—"*with* water," "*with* the Holy Ghost." And where it is used with reference to the baptismal sacrament he renders it by the religious word *taufen,* which, even in its etymological derivation, is a much lighter, freer, and more general word than those used in German to signify immersion, submersion, and the like. And in Rev. xix. 13 he translates *bapto,* BESPRENGET—BESPRINKLED. With all this before him, what honest man can ever again refer to Luther as authority for the doctrine that "*baptizo* means immerse and nothing else"?

Beza is quoted; but Beza affirms that *baptizo* means "*to wash*" as well as to immerse, and that it "differs from the word *dunai,* which signifies to plunge in, to go under."

Bretschneider is quoted; but in his formal definition of *baptizo* he says, it "properly means often to dip, *often to wash;* then to wash, *simply to cleanse;* in the middle voice, *I wash or cleanse myself.*" This writer, says Dr. Fuller, "is confessedly the most critical lexicographer of the New Testament."

Fritzeche is quoted; but on Mark vii. 4, 8 he agrees with Grotius in giving *baptizo* the gene-

ral signification of "*wash,*" just as our English translators have done, some of whom were immersionists.

Reinhard is quoted; but in looking over his theology we find such passages as these:—"It is known that the word *baptizo* means to *wash* [*abwaschen*], to cleanse; and in the New Testament, as well as in other authors, it embraces various particular significations. *Baptismos* in the New Testament is used for a special or general *purification.*" "Earthly or perceptible, pure, natural water, in which a baptized person is immersed, *or* with which he is *partially sprinkled,* is the baptism instituted by Christ." "The form or rite consists of an immersion *or sprinkling* in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which is clear from the words of the institution itself." (*Reinhard's Dogmatik,* pp. 567, 570, 572.)

Bloomfield is quoted; but on Mark vii. 4, 8 Bloomfield says, "Here we are not to suppose an *immersion* implied, (that being never used, except when some *actual* and not *possible* pollution had been incurred,) *but merely ordinary washing,* or perhaps, on occasions of urgent haste, *sprinkling.* Hence the gloss (for it is only a gloss) of some manuscripts,—*rantizontai.*"

Buddeus is quoted. We have not his theology at hand to refer to; but, from our knowledge of Buddeus, we are confident that he no more makes immersion essential to Christian baptism than does Reinhard.

The Leipsic Free Inquiry on this subject is cited; but the author agrees that under cer-

tain conditions "*the word means cleansing or washing,*" (p. 7.)

From these specimens the reader will see the way in which Baptist controversialists deal with authorities, and how they make learned men say what they never meant to say,—nay, what they have pointedly contradicted and denied. A man says that *baptizo* means immerse, and his words are caught up and printed in every Baptist book, and recited in every Baptist pulpit, in proof that *baptizo* everywhere and always means immersion; when that same man holds the contrary, and has so declared, sometimes on the same page and in the same line from which the quotation is made. Is this fair? Is it honest? *We* have admitted that *baptizo* sometimes means immerse, especially in the classics; but would it be a just version of our sentiments to quote those admissions in proof that *baptizo* means only to immerse, or that it must be so interpreted in the New Testament? Certainly not. It would be a base misrepresentation. We hold, with Dr. Owen, that "*no one instance can be given in the Scriptures wherein* BAPTIZO *doth necessarily signify either to dip or to plunge.*" Dr. Owen, says Rice, "is one of the greatest men who has lived."

As to Professor Anthon's opinion, given to Dr. Parmly, respecting the force of *baptizo*, and concerning which our Baptist friends make so much ado, we will merely quote the remarks of Dr. Rice in his debate with Campbell:—

"Dr. Anthon, I presume, is a classical scholar; but I have abundantly proved that an acquaint-

ance with classic Greek will not qualify a man to expound the language of the New Testament, which is written in Hebrew-Greek. The classic usage, as Ernesti and Dr. Campbell and Professor Stuart affirm, will, if followed, in many cases entirely mislead the interpreter of the New Testament. I would attach very little importance, therefore, to the opinion of a classical scholar concerning an important word in the New Testament, unless I knew he had studied the idiom of the Greek spoken by the Jews and inspired writers. Dr. Anthon decided that Dr. Spring was in error concerning this word. But I venture to say that Dr. Spring is quite as well known as a scholar as the gentleman who sat in judgment upon him. Dr. Spring is one of the first men in our country; and it will not do to attempt to put down the views he may have expressed merely by the *ipse dixit* of Dr. Anthon. Dr. Clarke will, perhaps, be admitted to have been equal as a classical scholar—at least, so far as *languages* are concerned—to Dr. Anthon; and he says it is certain that *baptizo* means both to dip *and to sprinkle.* Perhaps Dr. Dwight will be admitted to have been superior in Biblical criticism to Dr. Anthon; and he, after a thorough examination of the subject, came fully to the conclusion that, in the Scriptures, *baptizo* does not at all mean to immerse. Dr. Scott, the learned commentator, was of a similar opinion. I will put the authority of such men as these against that of Anthon." (P. 176.)

It is also noticeable in these quotations that Dr. Fuller gives them as "*concessions* from learned

men not Baptists." Alexander Campbell had so presented them before. But a *concession* is the act of granting or yielding, implying a demand or claim from the party to whom it is made; and many of the authors named lived anterior to the rise of the Baptist controversy, or in countries where this subject was never mooted. What such have said cannot therefore be made to pass for the "concessions" of men who had the point in debate distinctly before them, and yielded only to the pressure of demand. They spoke these things, if they are rightly quoted, not in the way of concessions to the strength of Baptist argument, but in the way of free etymological illustrations of great spiritual truths,—just as Dr. Chalmers refers to the practice of the Oriental Churches of administering baptism by immersion. They did not mean to admit that immersion enters into the essence and validity of baptism as a Christian sacrament. Else why did they not practice immersion? Or why were they content without being immersed themselves? How could they say that their own baptism was no baptism at all, and yet not seek after any other? They were Christian men. They taught that baptism is necessary. And yet we are to be told that they held and believed there could be no baptism without *immersion*, and thus regarded their own personal and cherished Christianity as a mere farce!

We feel particularly indignant, in this connection, at Alexander Campbell, for the manner in which he professes to quote Luther. In his Debate with Rice, p. 152, he says, "I place at the head of the

list the Reformer and translator, Martin Luther. In the fifth of the Smalcald Articles, drawn up by Luther, he says, 'Baptism is nothing else than the word of God with immersion in water.'" The original words of Luther are these:—"*Die Taufe ist nichts anders denn Gottes wort im wasser;*" the literal English of which is, "*Baptism is nothing else than the word of God in water.*" Luther here is not speaking of mode at all, but of the constitution and nature of the baptismal sacrament. He quotes in the same connection from Augustine:—"When the word comes to be with the element, it becomes a sacrament." It is the union of the word and water to constitute this sacrament, of which he is treating, and not the connection of the candidate with the water. "*Baptism is the word of God in water:*" *i.e.* the word of God demands the use of water, and in that water the word of God is reflected. As he elsewhere expresses it, "The sacrament is the visible word;" or, as he says again, "The word is included in the water." There is no immersion about it. The mode of administering the ordinance is not at all in point. It has no place in the passage. Yet this is the way "learned men not Baptists" are quoted to prove that Baptists are right, and nobody else!

But, if our Baptist friends think to settle this question by authorities, we also have a few, to which we now invite attention.

Dr. Dwight, one of the most distinguished theologians and scholars this country has ever produced, says, "I have examined almost one hundred instances in which the word *baptizo* and its deriva-

tives are used in the New Testament, and four in the Septuagint,—these, so far as I have observed, being all the instances contained in both. By this examination it is to my apprehension evident that the following things are true:—That the primary meaning of these terms is *cleansing*,—the *effect*, not the *mode*, of washing; and that these words, although often capable of denoting any mode of washing, whether by affusion, sprinkling, or immersion, (since cleansing was familiarly accomplished by the Jews in all these ways,) yet in many instances cannot, without obvious impropriety, be made to signify immersion, and in others cannot signify it at all." (Theol. vol. iv. p. 345.)

Dr. Henderson says, "With respect to the Greek word *baptizo*, after having read almost every work that professes to throw any light upon it, and carefully examined all the passages in which both it and its derivatives occur in the sacred volume, and a very considerable number of those in which it is found in classic authors, we are free to confess we have not yet fallen in with a single instance in which it can be satisfactorily proved that it signifies a submersion of the whole body, without at the same time conveying the idea that the submersion was permanent, *i.e.* that the body thus submerged sunk to rise no more. So far as has yet been ascertained, the word is never used by any ancient author in the sense of one person performing an act of submersion upon another." How evident, therefore, that this word has a peculiar and specific sense when employed by the Holy Ghost, and that,

when so employed, mere immersion cannot be its meaning.

Dr. Watson says, "The verb *bapto, with its derivatives*, signifies to dip the hand into a dish, to stain a vesture with blood, to wet the body with dew, to paint or smear the face with colors, to stain the hand by pressing a substance, to be overwhelmed in the waters as a sunken ship, to be drowned by falling into the water, to sink, in the neuter sense, to immerse totally, to plunge up to the neck, to be immersed up to the middle, to be drunk with wine, to be dyed, tinged, or imbued, to wash by affusion of water, to pour water upon the hands or any part of the body, *to sprinkle.* A word then of such application affords as good proof of sprinkling, or partial dipping, or washing with water, as for immersion in it. The controversy on this accommodating word has been carried on to weariness; and if even the advocates of immersion could prove—what they have not been able to do—that *plunging* is the primary meaning of the term, they would gain nothing, since in Scripture it is notoriously used to express other applications of water."

Dr. Owen says, "*Baptizo* signifies *to wash*, as instances out of all authors may be given,—Suidas, Hesychius, Julius Pollux, Phavorinus, and Eustachius. It is first used in the Scripture, Mark i. 8; John i. 33; and to the same purpose in Acts i. 5. In every place it either signifies to pour, or the expression is equivocal:" Heb. ix. 9, 10. "*Baptismos* is any kind of washing, whether by dipping or sprinkling, putting the thing to be washed in

the water, or applying the water to the thing itself to be washed. . . . As it [*baptizo*] expresseth baptism, it denotes *to wash only*, and not to dip at all: for so it is expounded, Tit. iii. 5. . . . As the word is applied unto the ordinance, the sense of dipping is utterly excluded."

The learned Calmet, in his Dictionary, defines "*baptismos*, from *baptizo*, *to wash*, to dip or immerge."

Dr. Hill, of St. Mary's College, St. Andrews, says, "Both sprinkling and immersion are implied in the word *baptizo:* both were used in the religious ceremonies of the Jews, and both may be considered as significant of the purpose of baptism." (Divinity, p. 470.)

Dr. Adam Clarke, admitted to have been an eminent linguist, says, (Matt. iii. 6,) "Were the people dipped, or sprinkled? *for it is certain* BAPTO *and* BAPTIZO *mean both.*"

The theologian Dr. John Dick says, "Nothing certain as to mode can be learned from the original term *baptizo*, because it has different meanings, signifying sometimes *to immerse*, and sometimes *to wash.*" (Theol. vol. ii. p. 377.)

The Westminster divines, in the Larger Catechism, say, "Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the *washing with water.*"

Dr. Scott, in his Commentary on Matt. iii., says, "*Baptizo* seems to be a word borrowed from the Greek authors, signifying to plunge in, or bedew with, water, without any exact distinction; and it was adopted into the style of Scripture in a peculiar

sense, to signify the use of water in this ordinance, and various spiritual matters which have a relation to it. Some, indeed, contend zealously that *baptism* always signifies *immersion;* and learned men who have regarded Jewish traditions more than either the language of Scripture or the Greek idiom are very decided in this respect; but the use of the words *baptize* and *baptism* in the New Testament cannot accord with this exclusive interpretation." Such was the opinion of this distinguished man, as he says, "after many years' consideration and study."

The great and pious Spener says, "Mere pouring upon is also to be called baptism." (*Erklarung Christ. Lehre*, p. 410.)

The distinguished theologian David Hollaz, whose early death, in 1713, has often been deplored, makes this statement:—"It is necessary that an individual should be baptized with water,—that is, *washed* in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but it matters not whether this ablution is performed by immersion into water, or by affusion or sprinkling with water." (*Exam. Theolog. Acroamat.*)

Haupt, in his *Examin. Dogmat.* pp. 365, 366, says, "Baptism is the immersion *or sprinkling* of a human being in or with water, on the ground of the command and clothed with the word of God. . . . *Baptismos* in the New Testament denotes particular kinds of *purifying.*"

The learned commentator Olshausen, on Mark vii. 1, 2, 8, says, "*Baptismos* is here, as at Heb. ix. 10, *ablution,—washing* generally."

Dr. Cumming says, "In the New Testament *baptizo* is used in the sense of *pouring on*, or *sprinkling*."

Dr. Wall, who has searched very profoundly into this whole subject, says, "The word *baptizo*, in Scripture, signifies *to wash* in general, without determining the sense to this or that sort of washing."

Even Dr. Gale, himself a strenuous Baptist, writing upon this controversy, is constrained to admit, that "the word *baptizo* perhaps does not so necessarily express the action of putting under water, as, in general, a thing's being in that condition, no matter how it comes so, *whether it is put into the water, or the water comes over it.*" (Refl. 122.)

Dr. Miller, of Princeton, says, "This word [*baptizo*] does not necessarily, nor even commonly, signify to immerse, but also implies to wash, to sprinkle, to pour on water, and to tinge or dye with any liquid, and, therefore, accords very well with the mode of baptism by sprinkling or affusion. . . . It does legitimately signify the application of water in any way, as well as by immersion. Nay, I can assure you, if the most mature and competent Greek scholars that ever lived may be allowed to decide in this case, that many examples of the use of this word occur in Scripture in which it not only *may*, but manifestly *must*, signify sprinkling, perfusion, or washing in any way."

Edwards says, "*Baptizo* has indeed been used for all the modes of washing,—sprinkling, pouring, and immersing; whereas it does not express the one nor the other, but *washing* only; and this may

be done in either of the modes; and, therefore, when we read of any person or thing being baptized, we cannot conclude from the word itself whether it was done by affusion, aspersion, or immersion."

Dr. Beecher says, "The word *baptizo*, as a religious term, means neither dip nor sprinkle, immerse nor pour, nor any other external action in applying a fluid to the body or the body to a fluid, nor any action that is limited to one mode of performance; but, as a religious term, it means, at all times, to purify or cleanse,—words of a meaning so general as not to be confined to any mode, or agent, or means, or object, whether material or spiritual, but to leave the widest scope for the question as to the mode. So that in this usage it is in every respect a perfect synonym of the word *katharizo*."

Dr. Hunnius says, "*Baptism* means to dip, to wash. The *washing* of the Christian is called *baptism*." (Epit. Cred. § 632.)

Dr. Schmucker says, "It is evident that many of the purifications termed *baptisms* in the New Testament were certainly performed by sprinkling and pouring; whilst it is not *certain* that they were performed by immersion in a single case. Hence, there is much more Scripture authority for sprinkling and pouring, than for immersion, in the New Testament usage of the word *baptism*. . . We have the authority of Paul and Mark, that *baptizo* signifies various applications of water practiced by the Jews in their religious rites, which certainly included sprinkling, pouring, washing, bathing,

but in no case, certainly, immersion." (Manual, p. 143.)

Wesley is sometimes referred to by Baptists in support of their interpretation of *baptizo*. We shall therefore give him a chance to speak for himself. "The matter of this sacrament is water, which, as it has a natural power of cleansing, is the more fit for this symbolical use. *Baptism* is performed by *washing, dipping,* or *sprinkling* the person in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; I say by *washing, sprinkling,* or *dipping;* because it is not determined in Scripture in which of these ways it shall be done, neither by any express precept, nor by any such example as clearly proves it, *nor by the force or meaning of the word baptism.*"

Dr. Rice says, "I have now examined every passage in the Bible and in the Apocryphal writings of the Jews, where the word *baptizo* is used in a literal sense, without reference to the ordinance of Christian baptism; and my clear conviction is, that there is not one instance in which it can be proved to mean *immerse;* that in every instance, except, perhaps, one which may be doubtful, it can be, and has been, proved to express the application of water to the person or thing by pouring or sprinkling." (Debate with Campbell, p. 158.)

Gerhard, according to Tholuck, "the most learned, and with the learned the most beloved, among the heroes of Lutheran orthodoxy," says, "Whether a man is baptized by immersion into water, or by sprinkling, pouring, or applying the water to him, it is the same." (Loci Theol. ix 137.)

Dr. Schaff says, "The application of *water* is necessary to this sacrament; but the quantity of it, as also the quality, is certainly not essential. Otherwise we should in fact bind the efficacy of the Holy Ghost to what is material and accidental." (History, p. 570.)

Dr. Tracy says, "The word *baptism* is derived from the Greek *baptisma* and *baptizo*, and more remotely from *bapto*, and properly signifies *a washing*, whether the substance washed be partially or wholly immersed in the liquid, or the liquid be applied to the substance, by running, pouring, rubbing, dropping, or sprinkling." (Encycl. Rel. Knowl. p. 23.)

Carpzov, in his Issagoge, says, "*Baptism* is a Greek word, and in itself means *a washing*, in whatever way performed, whether by *immersion* in water, or by *aspersion*," (p. 1085.) "It is called in Scripture *the washing of water*. . . . It is not restricted to immersion or aspersion: hence it has been a matter of indifference from the beginning whether to administer baptism by immersion or by the pouring of water." (P. 330.)

If, then, there is any weight in authority, here is an array of names, representing learning, industry, piety, and love for truth, enough, and sufficiently directed to the point in dispute, to be an adequate and complete offset to all the authors that our Baptist friends can by any means produce. We have shown that the most valuable of those referred to by Dr. Fuller have been misquoted and misrepresented, being made to speak what they never meant, and what many of them ex-

plicitly deny. The same is probably true of others to whose writings we have not had access, or the time to examine. And as to the few who have said that immerse is a meaning which always adheres to *baptizo*, all that we have to say is, that they have said what cannot be made good, and that their opinions are worthless by the side of what we have given as an offset to them.

So far, then, as *authorities* are concerned, our Baptist brethren are still as far from proving their doctrine as ever. Every successive step but makes it plainer that they have assumed grounds which cannot be maintained; whilst our position grows firmer and firmer that *baptizo* means to *wash, cleanse, and purify, without reference to mode.*

CHAPTER IX.

BAPTIZO IN THE SEPTUAGINT.

We come now to examine a kind of Greek which is more closely allied to the Greek in which the New Testament was written,—viz., the Greek version of the seventy translators of the Old Testament and Apocrypha, made during the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, about two hundred and fifty years before the commencement of the Christian era.

The first passage we note in which this word occurs is Isaiah xxi. 4. Dr. Fuller thus gives it,—

that is to say, *his version* of it:—"The prophet, foreseeing the capture of Babylon and the subjugation of the empire by the Medes and Persians, says, 'My heart pants, *and iniquity sinks* (baptizes) me.'" (P. 49.) Dr. Fuller is horrified at the evident slips of the pen made by Mr. Lape in quoting from an Apocryphal book, under the head of "Instances from the classic Greek of the Old Testament," and in miswriting a Greek word. He indeed exculpates Mr. Lape from "designed perversion of God's word," but holds him "inexcusable" for his "entire ignorance." What then shall be said of Dr. Fuller, when we open the Bible and find that the passage reads, not "*iniquity sinks me*," but "FEARFULNESS AFFRIGHTED ME"? Has he *designedly* or *ignorantly* put words in the prophet's lips which the prophet never uttered? Dr. Alexander renders the original Hebrew, "*Horror* APPALLS *me.*" (See his commentary on this verse.) Scott says, "The prophet here seems to personate Belshazzar on the night when Babylon was taken." (See his Commentary.) The passage evidently points to the scene described by Daniel, v. 1–6:—"Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand. . . . And they brought the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God, which was at Jerusalem, and the king and his princes, and his wives and his concubines, drank in them. . . . In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote.

Then *the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed and his knees smote one against another.*" Accordingly, Lowth paraphrases the passage as if Belshazzar were saying to himself, "When I thought to be at ease and to have some respite from trouble and anxiety, *then the fearful apprehensions of God's judgments* SEIZED *me.*" (See his Commentary.) And all this fright, appalling horror, trembling, and seizure of the soul with fearful apprehension of God's judgments is signified in the version of the Seventy—which is honored and dignified by being quoted by Christ himself and his inspired apostles—by the one word BAPTIZEI. Did those translators mean that Belshazzar or the prophet was *dipped* in horror? Certainly not. The whole case shows a sudden *coming of something upon him*, which was the *pouring out* of the vengeance of God. It was the wrath of God *breaking upon—an overwhelming, a bringing of something upon* the subject, and nothing more. The idea of *plunging*, or *putting the subject into*, is entirely excluded.

The next place in the Septuagint in which we find this word is 2 Kings v. 14:—"Then he [Naaman] went down and dipped [*ebaptisato*] himself seven times in Jordan, *according to the saying of the man of God.*" Dr. Fuller lays great stress upon this passage, and is amazed that any "candid man" can any longer doubt with this instance before him. He refers to it on all occasions, and evidently regards it as his strongest point. Let us then look at it with care.

It will be observed that the record says that Naaman "baptized himself *according to the saying of the man of God.*" We must, then, ascertain what that saying was, and interpret the *ebaptisato* according to the sense of the terms used in the command of which the baptism was the fulfillment. This is plain common sense:—that if Naaman *baptized* himself *according to the saying of the man of God*, that "saying of the man of God" must contain the true sense in which the word *baptizo* is used.

Going back, then, a few verses, we read that "Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying, *Go and* WASH [*lousai*] in Jordan seven times, . . . and thou shalt *be clean* [*katharisthase*]. But Naaman was wroth, and went away, and said, Behold, I thought, he will surely come out to me, and stand, and call on the name of the Lord his God, *and strike his hand over* THE PLACE. [It would seem that Naaman's leprosy was confined to one particular location on his body.] Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not WASH [*lousomai*] in them *and* BE CLEAN? So he turned, and went away in a rage. And his servants came near, and spake unto him, and said, My father, if the prophet had bid thee do some great thing, wouldst thou not have done it? How much rather, then, when *he saith to thee,* WASH [*lousai*] AND BE CLEAN?"

The saying of the man of God, then, according to which Naaman *baptized* himself, was not a command to immerse himself totally, but to *wash and cleanse* himself. The Greek words in the command

are not *bapto* and *baptizo*, but *louo* and *katharizo*. And, according to Dr. Fuller's own argument, on page 31, we can demonstrate that the prophet's bidding had no sort of reference to immersion. What does Dr. Fuller say? how does he reason? "Jesus could have been at no loss for a word clearly to express his meaning. Did he intend *sprinkling?* The word was *rantizo*. Did he require *pouring?* The word was *keo*. If *wash, nipto,* [which, by-the-way, according to Dr. Fuller's own authority on page 21, means to wet or wash only the hands.] If bathe, *louo*. If *immerse or dye, bapto. If immerse and nothing else,* the word was *baptizo.*" We argue, then, upon Dr. Fuller's ground, if Elisha intended Naaman to immerse himself totally and nothing else, *the word* to express it was *baptizo*. But the prophet, according to the Seventy, did not use the word *baptizo*, but *louo* and *katharizo*. Therefore it inevitably follows, from Dr. Fuller's own showing, that the prophet did not intend that Naaman should immerse himself. And if Elisha did not direct Naaman to immerse himself, and Naaman's baptism was according to Elisha's direction, the Seventy have either used the word *baptizo* wrongly, or it does not mean immersion and nothing else. We cannot conceive how Dr. Fuller, with all his dexterity and cunning, is to extricate himself from this dilemma.

But we do not stop with this. We insist that *louo* and *katharizo* in the prophet's command must give the sense of *baptizo*, which describes the act of Naaman in complying with the command; for

it is expressly declared that he "*baptized himself* ACCORDING TO THE SAYING OF THE MAN OF GOD." There can be no dispute about the fact that *katharizo* means simply to cleanse, especially in the legal sense of purification, which was for the most part performed by sprinkling or pouring water over the subject. And *louo* evidently means nearly the same thing. It is used eight times in the New Testament, and in no one instance does it convey any other meaning than that of *cleanse or purify*. In Titus iii. 5 it denotes the work of God's Holy Spirit in purifying and renewing the heart. In Acts xvi. 33 it denotes the act of moistening and cleansing wounds inflicted by stripes. In Rev. i. 5 it denotes the cleansing of the sinner's conscience by the blood of Christ. Porphyry uses it to denote the purification of maidens about to be married, by sprinkling them with water brought in pitchers for the purpose; and Basil uses it to denote the purification of a sick man by sprinkling with water, anointing with oil, and invoking upon him the Holy Ghost. Galen's Lexicon to Hippocrates explains it as meaning "not only to wash or bathe, but also to moisten, foment, pour, or sprinkle." If, then, the command was simply to wash, cleanse, or purify in Jordan's waters, and if *baptizo* denotes the fulfillment of that command, the point is settled that *baptizo* in this case means nothing more (and cannot be assigned any other sense) than simply to *wash, cleanse, or purify*. We challenge Dr. Fuller to confine himself to this instance and make any thing else out of it.

How Naaman executed the prophet's command

is of no importance. He may have gone into the stream of Jordan and literally *dipped* the affected parts which he expected the man of God to touch, or he may have sat down to perform the enjoined ablution upon the shore; but, if he even went in and totally immersed himself seven times, it does not alter the case. There are many ways of washing; and it was still a baptism, *not* because it was an immersion, but because it was a *washing;* that having been the only idea in the prophet's mind, and the only idea in the mind of the historian when he said that Naaman did according to the prophet's saying.

And we are also fully borne out in this view by other versions of the Bible. The old Latin version of Jerome, made more than fourteen hundred years ago, has *lavo* where the Seventy have *baptizo,*—a word which means simply *to wash,* without prescribing the mode, and, where it takes in any allusion to mode, that mode is TO BESPRINKLE, or to apply the water to the thing laved. It also has the judicial sense of *expiate and clear.* A total immersion is quite outside of its common scope.

The German Bible, pronounced one of the best translations that have ever been made, has *taufen.* If Luther had thought that Naaman's baptism was a total immersion, he certainly would have used the word *versenken,* or *untertauchen.*

The Douay Bible says, "He went down and WASHED in the Jordan." And the Coverdale Bible, the Geneva Bible, and Matthew's Bible, all have "*washed*" instead of dipped.

Now, putting all these things together, are we

not fully authorized to say that, so far as *baptizo* applies to the cleansing of Naaman, it no more means "*a total immersion and nothing else*" than it means *sprinkling and nothing else?* The fact is, it means neither, but simply a *cleansing or purification.* This is all that the prophet told him to do; and inspired authority tells us that he did "according to the saying of the man of God."

A third passage in the Septuagint in which *baptizo* occurs is Judith xii. 7, where it is said of that heroic woman that "she went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia and *washed* [*ebaptizeto*] herself in a fountain [*paga,—spring*] of water by the camp. And when she came out, [Douay version, *when she came up,*] she besought the Lord God of Israel to direct her way." What does this mean? Dr. Fuller says, "She is *purifying* herself for a great and glorious deed." (P. 39.) Exactly so; and that is precisely the meaning of the word in this text. The Douay and King James versions both render it *wash.* The German version has it *wusch sich,—washed herself.* The ancient Syriac renders it by a term signifying *to wash.* It means nothing more than a simple ceremonial cleansing or purification. The heroine is contemplating the deliverance of her country from a ruthless invader. She wishes to secure the help of Israel's God. And just as in the case of Telemachus, with waters from the hoary sea shed over his hands,—

"The royal suppliant to Minerva pray'd,"—

so she went fasting to the Bethulian spring to *purify* herself with its untainted waters, fresh from their source, the more acceptably to come before

her God. All idea of *immersion* in the spring is quite out of the question.

But, in order to make the case yield to his tottering cause, Dr. Fuller says that this purification was performed "in a sequestered valley." Not so: it was performed at a spring "*by the camp,*" or, as it is still stronger in the Greek, "IN *the camp,*"—EN *ta parembola.* He says that it was done in the privacy of the "night." So Curtis repeats:—"It was *by night,* when she would not be observed." But this cannot be proven. The word *nux* also means *evening.* The German version has it *abends;* that is, *evening.* And the account stating what occurred after the purification had been performed says expressly, in the ninth verse, "*So she came in clean, and remained in the tent until she did* EAT HER MEAT AT EVENING." And are we to be told that a beautiful and chaste woman like Judith went out among a vast army of rude and unoccupied soldiers in the evening before supper-time, and completely immersed herself in an open and public spring, and that for three successive days? Let the thinking judge of the probability of such a story. Dr. Arnald, in his commentary on this passage, expresses the greatest astonishment that a woman of such beauty could move at all among such a camp without encountering insult and violence. What, then, would her situation have been if we add the bathing of her naked person by immersion at nightfall in a spring to which the soldiers doubtless came to quench their thirst? The thing cannot be: and so *baptizo* cannot here mean to immerse and nothing else.

But Dr. Fuller can't give it up. The passage must be made to give *baptizo* the meaning of immerse, even though he should have to interpolate the record. And we here, publicly, boldly, and with a full understanding of what we are about, charge interpolation upon him. Whether he has done it ignorantly or intentionally is not for us to decide.

On page 40 of his book he positively asserts that, "As if to leave no doubt, *it is expressly said that* SHE CAME OUT OF THE WATER." He gives quotation marks and all, to have us believe that he has literally transferred these words from the record to his pages. But we utterly, peremptorily, and without qualification deny that there is any thing anywhere in this account, either in Hebrew, in Greek, in Latin, in German, or in English, that says aught about coming out of "*the water.*" The only thing that affords even the remotest hint in that direction lies in the English phrase "*and when she came out* she besought the Lord." But a theory which interprets this as referring to *the water*, cannot stand for a moment. It is nowhere said that she ever went into the water; and it is unnaturally violent and altogether gratuitous to say that her coming out means a coming "out of *the water.*" What she came out of was, of course, what she went into; and it is expressly said that she "*went into the valley of Bethulia.*" Her coming out was therefore a coming out of "the valley of Bethulia."

The Vulgate has *et ut ascendebat,—and as she went up,* or, *as soon as* she went up,—she prayed.

The allusion cannot be to any thing but her *going up to her tent.*

The Septuagint has *kai hos anebа, edeeto. Aneba* is one form of the same word used by Xenophon to denote a military *expedition,*—certainly a very different thing from an emersion, from a plunge in the water. It signifies a going up from one place to another. It is used in the New Testament to denote Christ's *going up* to Jerusalem, *going up* into the mountain to pray, *going up* into the temple, the *going up* of the disciples to the feast, Peter's *going up* upon the house-top, and so on. Homer uses it again and again to denote the act of penetrating into the interior of a country and of advancing toward a capital. And we avow that before any man can find emersion in it he will first have to put it there. Its plainest and primary meaning is, *the going up* from one place to another; and, as used in the passage before us, it can mean nothing more nor less than the going up of Judith from the fountain where she purified herself to the tent in which she reposed in the camp of Holofernes.

And the German version, if possible, is still more conclusive. It cuts off even the last lingering shadow of possibility that the phrase might perhaps refer to a coming out of the water. It renders it all by the adverb *darnach,—afterwards.* Having purified herself at the fountain "by the camp, *afterwards,*" *i.e.* after her purification had been completed, and she was again on her way to her allotted place, "*afterwards* she prayed to the

Lord." The thing is too plain to admit of further illustration.

The fourth and only remaining passage from the Septuagint to be examined, in which *baptizo* occurs, is Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25. "He that *washeth* [*baptizomenos*] himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his (*loutro*) washing?"

Here we have two different words referring to precisely the same thing, and which, so far as this text is concerned, are necessarily exact synonyms of each other. We have already proven that *louo*, one of the words here used, denotes the general idea of *washing* in the sense of purification. It is therefore a sufficient injunction upon Dr. Fuller's theory of the meaning of *baptizo* to know that the Seventy here use it as the exact synonym of *louo*. For as *louo* is never used to denote "a total immersion and nothing else," so *baptizo* cannot mean "a total immersion and nothing else" where it is used interchangeably with *louo*.

But we go further. The son of Sirach is talking about purification from the contaminating touch of a dead body. He calls that purification a *baptism*. And we now assert that the vital, prominent, and essential part of that purification was performed by *sprinkling, and by sprinkling alone*. Does any one doubt it, let him read the nineteenth chapter of Numbers, where God himself lays down the law in this case:—"And whosoever toucheth one that is slain with the sword in the open field, or a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days. And for an unclean

person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel, and a clean person shall *take hyssop and dip it in the water,* AND SPRINKLE IT *upon him that toucheth a bone, or one slain, or one dead,* or a grave, *and the clean person shall* SPRINKLE *upon the unclean* on the third day and on the seventh day." This is the statute of God for the purification of a man defiled by touching the dead, *and the whole of it.* The succeeding verses quoted by Dr. Fuller, about washing clothes and bathing, refer to the clean person who does the sprinkling, and not to the one defiled for whom the sprinkling was done. Let the reader compare the nineteenth with the twenty-first verse, where this bathing is expressly referred to the administrator and not to the subject, and he will see the truth of our statement. Josephus, in a professed and minute description of this rite, (Ant. b. 4, c. 4, sec. 6,) says nothing about washing or bathing as a part of it. Philo, in a similar passage, speaks only of *sprinkling.* Or, if any still doubt, we bring the testimony of Paul, who says expressly that it was *the ashes of an heifer* SPRINKLING *the unclean that sanctified to the purification of the flesh:* Heb. ix. 13.

Here, then, is a purification from which every thing like immersion is utterly excluded,—nay, in which *sprinkling* is the mode explicitly commanded by God himself, "The question, then, comes to this dilemma," says Mr. Hall: "either the Jews had abandoned the mode of purifying from a dead body, as specifically and minutely pointed out by God, or here was a baptism by sprinkling."

The demonstration is therefore complete, that *baptizo*, as used in the Septuagint, does not denote "a total immersion and nothing else," but has assigned to it that nobler and higher sense for which it was chosen to designate the foundation ordinance of Christianity,—the sense of *purification*.

How remarkable that, at the very moment we begin to touch upon ground even though but remotely connected with Christianity, the word that is always used to denote the ordinance of baptism at once assumes a settled religious sense, from which, when applied to this sacrament, as we shall see, it never departs.

CHAPTER X.

BAPTIZO IN THE FATHERS.

THERE is still another department of Greek writing, outside of the New Testament, the examination of which is particularly pertinent to this controversy. We refer to the Christian Greek authors and the patristic literature. The Fathers for the most part understood and spoke the Greek language, and were familiar with the Christian acceptation of Greek terms. If they used *baptizo* in a sense different from mere immersion, we may be assured that immersion is not its Christian meaning.

We are not now concerning ourselves about

their frequent *practice* of administering baptism by immersion. Dr. Carson agrees that "the authority of the Fathers on this question is *not their practice*, but their use of the word. *On their practice*," says he, "*I should not have the least reliance on any question.*" (P. 472.) We agree that it was very much the habit in their day to baptize by immersion. Hence, if we can show from their writings that they understood and used the word baptism in a sense other than that of immersion, that showing must be particularly strong against our Baptist friends, for the reason that it is the testimony, to some extent, of immersionists as well as Greeians.

Dr. Carson says of the Fathers that "they knew the meaning of the language which they spoke. . . . To suppose that persons who spoke the Greek language might understand their [the apostles'] words in a sense different from that in which they used them would be to charge the Scripture as not being a revelation. Whatever was the sense in which the apostles used the word must have been known to all who heard them or read their writings." (P. 473.) To the writings of these earlier and mostly Greek Christian authors, then, we carry our inquiry.

Dr. Carson maintains that "there is not an instance in all the Fathers in which *baptizo* or any of its derivatives are used except to signify immerse;" that, "without exception, they used the word always for immersion." This he asserts as a scholar claiming to be "acquainted with the Fathers." How far this scholarship and acquaint-

ance go in this department, and what his sweeping assertion is worth, we shall see presently.

Dr. Fuller waxes very bold, and *defies* us to produce a single instance in which *baptizo* means aught but immerse. We accept his challenge. He shall have the instance. He has it already. But we will multiply it for him by the production of passages, not from the poets and philosophers of heathendom, but from those who knew both the Scriptures and the Greek language, in which it is wholly impossible to assign to this word the meaning of "immerse and nothing else."

The first passage we adduce is from Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 387, Lugduni Batav., 1616. He is here speaking on the subject of *baptism*. He traces it even in the lustrative rites of the heathen world. He says that there is "*eikoon baptismatos*, —a picture, image, representation of baptism, which has been handed down from Moses to the poets; as, for example, 'Penelope, having [*hudraino*] *moistened or washed herself*, and having on clean apparel, prays.' (Odyss. iv. 759.) 'Telemachus, having [*nipto*] *washed* his hands in the hoary sea, prayed to Minerva.' (Odyss. ii. 261.) This was the Jewish custom [*hoos baptizesthai*] *to be baptized in this way*, even often upon the bed or couch."

This is a passage of great strength, and has given to the Baptist champions no little trouble since it was first broached by President Beecher. Let the reader scrutinize it well. Homer says that Penelope moistened or washed herself. The word is *hudraino*, which conveys no idea of mode.

The Greek language abundantly sanctions its application to pouring or affusion. And this wetting or washing Clement pronounces *eikoon baptismatos*, "the image of baptism." He must needs, therefore, have considered *baptizo* no more than *hudraino*,—merely a religious washing, no matter how performed.

Again: Homer says that Telemachus *washed his hands for prayer*. Pope's version of it is this:—

> "There, as *the waters o'er his hands he shed*,
> The royal suppliant to Minerva pray'd."

The original word is *nipto*, which expresses an act limited to the hands or feet. Beza denies that it ever applies to the whole body. The idea which it conveys is simply that of cleansing the part by the use of water, poured, sprinkled, or employed in any other mode. Pope says that it here means poured or shed upon. The hands are specifically named. And this religious lustration, which consisted in the mere pouring of water upon the hands, Clement calls *eikoon baptismatos*, "the image of baptism." There was no immersion in this case, and, beyond all question, no total immersion; and yet, according to this Father's sense of the word, it was a likeness of baptism. By authority of Clement, then, baptism is a religious lustration, but not necessarily an immersion.

But this is by no means the whole strength of the passage. Clement says that it was the custom of the Jews (*hoos*) *in like manner, in the same way*, TO BE BAPTIZED. The Jewish lustrations, then, which consisted in mere washings and hand-wash-

ings, by affusion, sprinkling, circumfusion, as well as any other mode, were real *baptisms*, and so called by this Greek Father. Is it not puerile, then, for any man to assert in the face of such facts that *baptizo* in the Greek language "always means immerse and has no other meaning"?

Yet further: Clement declares that it was the custom of the Jews to be *baptized* in this way, (*kai*) *and*, or *even*, oftentimes upon their bed or couch (*epi koitae*). The Jews were accustomed to recline on couches during meals, the same being often used to sleep on. These couches were ordinarily large enough to hold from three to five persons. And it was perhaps when reclining thus at meals that the custom was to undergo a process of lustration, which Clement here calls eing *baptized upon their couch*. And are we to be told that four or five men, upon a couch at dinner, were at times immersed while taking their meals? Are we to imagine pulleys fixed over the various couches in the dining-room, with ropes attached to the corners, and a baptistery under the floor, with trap-doors opening under the suspended guests, to let couches, men, and all down under the water as they proceeded to eat!

But Dr. Carson and Dr. Hague wish to know where we learn that *koitae* is a dinner-couch. They say, "it is a bed for sleeping on." Very well: only so much the worse for them. Clement says they were *baptized* upon their *koitae;* and to be immersed while lying on their bed for sleep is still further out of the question than immersion while eating dinner. A very comfortable night's rest

would they have after such a service! Perhaps Dr. Fuller would also call this "delightfully refreshing"!

But, say our Baptist friends, *epi koitae* does not mean *upon a bed*, but "*on account of a bed;*" "baptized on account of a bed"! Ah, and now it is our turn to ask, Where did they learn that? Hervetus, in commenting upon this passage in Clement, says, "The Jews washed themselves, not only at sacrifices, but also *at feasts;* and this is the reason why Clement says that they were purified or washed *upon a couch*, that is, *a dining-couch* or *triclinium.*" And no one will dare to deny that the original, primary, and pervading sense of *epi* is *upon, on, in.* To translate it "*on account of*" is far-fetched, quite beyond the ordinary range of its meaning, and destructive of the sense of the passage, except by supplying an idea the most foreign to the whole drift of Clement's remarks. In the corrected Latin Syllburg edition of Clemens, Hervetus renders it "*in lecta,*"—*in* or *upon* a resting-place, couch, bed, or dining-sofa. And Professor Wilson, of the Royal College, Belfast, remarks that "*epi koitae* suggests so distinctly the relation of *place,* that to prefer a different meaning appears very like going out of one's way to serve a purpose."

It was the custom of the Jews, then, to be baptized *on, in, upon,* their dining-couches or beds. Was this done by total immersion? The thing is impossible. How, then, was it done? We reply, by sprinkling, circumfusion, or *hand-washing;* and we say so by the authority of the Scriptures them-

selves. (See 2 Kings iii. 11; Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii 3; John ii. 6.) Immersion is absolutely excluded. Yet Clement, who "knew the meaning of the language which he spoke," calls it *baptizing*. If our Baptist friends can bring a stronger passage in proof of their understanding of *baptizo* than this against them, it yet remains to be produced.

Our next quotation is from Cyril of Alexandria, on Isaiah iv. 4, vol. ii., Paris, 1538. This Father speaks of the Jewish rite of sprinkling an unclean person with the ashes of a heifer as a baptism. His words are, "We have been *baptized*, not with mere water, nor yet with the ashes of a heifer, but with the Holy Spirit and fire." This passage makes the baptism by the ashes of a heifer as much a *baptism* as the baptism by water. What then was the baptism with the ashes of a heifer? Was it an *immersion?* We have the authority of God that it was not. See Heb. ix. 13: "The ashes of an heifer SPRINKLING the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh." The statute of God on the subject was, "They shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, *and* SPRINKLE *it upon* him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave." By the highest possible authority, then, the purification by the ashes of the heifer was a purification by *sprinkling*. It was not an immersion. But Cyril says it was a *baptism*. According to this Greek Father, then, immersion was not the meaning of *baptizo*. Its import is met by a religious

cleansing in which the specific mode was *sprinkling*. The same author has other passages to the same effect.

Ambrose, vol. ii. p. 333, Paris, 1609, furnishes another instance of the use of *baptizo* to denote a religious cleansing without immersion. "For he who is *baptized*, both according to the law and according to the gospel, is made clean,—according to the law, *in that Moses, with a bunch of hyssop,* SPRINKLED *the blood of a lamb.*" There was then a *baptism* according to the Jewish law. Was it an immersion? How would it read to say "*immersed* according to the law, in that Moses, with a bunch of hyssop, *sprinkled* the blood of a lamb"? Is sprinkling an immersion? By no means. But Ambrose says it is a *baptism*. Hence we add his authority to that of Clement and Cyril, that baptism and immersion are not synonymous.

The same Father furnishes us with other like instances. In vol. i. p. 356, he calls the application of the benefits of Christ's crucifixion and death, *baptism;* that is, a moral cleansing, forgiveness, purification. His words are as follows:—"*Unde sit* BAPTISMA *nisi de cruce Christi, de morte Christi?*" "Whence is *purgation* except from the cross of Christ, from the death of Christ?" Can baptism mean immersion here? Is there any sense in talking about "immersion from the cross and death of Christ"? *Baptisma* here means *cleansing*, to the utter exclusion of all idea of immersion.

Again, Ambrose says, (Apol. David. sec. 59.) "He who desired to be purified with a typical *baptism* was *sprinkled* with the blood of a lamb by

means of a bunch of hyssop." Was *sprinkling immersion?* Was sprinkling a type of immersion? Neither; but sprinkling was a *baptism*, and sprinkling the blood under the law was a type of *baptism* under the gospel. How ridiculous, then, to insist that baptism is "immersion and nothing else"!

In vol. ii. p. 355, the same Father, taking a general survey of the Jewish and heathen absolutions, thus sums up the whole matter. "There are many kinds of purifications, [*baptismatum*,] but the apostle proclaims one baptism. Why? There are heathen purifyings, [*baptismata*,] but they are not purifications [*baptismata*]. Washings they are; purifications [*baptismata*] they cannot be. The body is washed, but sin is not washed away; nay, in that washing sin is contracted. There were also Jewish purifyings, [*baptismata*;] some superfluous, others typical." Why were these Jewish and heathen *baptisms* no *baptisms?* Because "sin is not washed away" in them. But whether immersion washes away sin or not, is it not still an immersion? Could Ambrose have been guilty of saying, "Immersions they are, but immersions they cannot be"? Does not every one see at a glance that here the word *baptism*, in the very same sentence, has more than one meaning and must be rendered *washing, purification?*

Let us look next at some instances from Justin Martyr. Dr. Carson says, "Justin uses the word in the sense of immersion whenever he does use it,—never in any other sense." Let us see, then, what sort of reliance is to be placed upon this dogmatizer of Tubbermore.

See Justin's Dialogue with Trypho, p. 164, London, 1772. He is speaking of the Jewish rites and ceremonies as inadequate to purify a man from sin. He is holding up an inward "washing of repentance," as opposed to any outward ceremonial cleansings. He says, "What is the use of that *baptism* which purifies the flesh and body alone? Be *baptized* as to your soul, from anger and from covetousness, from envy and from hatred, and, lo! your body is pure." Now, would he have us figure to ourselves a man *immersing* his soul for the purification of his body? Can we conceive of a man immersing *from* a thing?—*from* anger and covetousness, *from* envy and hatred? We can easily understand how a man may *cleanse* his soul to make his body clean, and how he may be *cleansed from* vice; but immersion will in no way fit to this passage. There is no possible room for it. Cleansing or purification is here the certain, fixed, and only sense of *baptizo*, and that as given by a man who understood both the Scripture and the Greek language.

In another passage, speaking of the purifications copied by the heathen from the divine ordinances, he says, "The demons, hearing of this washing [*loutron*, religious cleansing] proclaimed by the prophet, caused those entering into their temples *to sprinkle themselves.*" Now, if the demons were thus imitating God's washing, as Justin affirms, and that divine purifying was a washing by *immersion*, how is it that they caused their worshipers "*to sprinkle themselves*"? Is sprinkling a copy of immersion? The demons once proclaimed the

divine authority of Jesus. They here proclaim that *sprinkling* is God's cleansing rite.

Again: Dr. Carson admits that Justin "sometimes speaks of circumcision as a *baptism.*" Was circumcision an immersion? Who will dare to affirm it? It was a bloody rite of purgation,—a sign of divine acceptance,—a ceremonial cleansing; and for this reason alone could it be called a baptism. And when this Father calls it a *baptism*, it is unanswerable proof that he attached to *baptizo* the idea of a religious purification, to the exclusion of immersion. Yet Mr. Carson can assert that "Justin uses the word in the sense of immersion,—never in any other sense"! How long will Christian people continue to be led astray by such guides?

We turn next to Tertullian, to inquire what meaning he attached to *baptizo*. *De Baptismo*, p. 257, Paris, 1634, he has this passage:—"At the sacred rites of Isis, or Mithra, they are initiated by a washing; they carry out their gods with washings; they expiate villas, houses, temples, and whole cities, by sprinkling with water carried around. Certainly they are purified in the Appolinarian and Eleusinian rites; and they say that they do this to obtain regeneration and to escape the punishment of their perjuries. Also, among the ancients, whoever had stained himself with murder expiated himself with purifying water. In view of these things, we see the zeal of the devil in rivalling the things of God, inasmuch as he thus also practices *baptism* among his own people." Here we have a description of the

various lustrations and expiations performed by the devil's people, not only upon their own bodies, but also upon "villas, houses, temples, and *whole cities*," and that "*by sprinkling with water carried around*." And yet Tertullian sums it all up as the devil's "baptism," [*baptismum.*] Will any one have the effrontery to say that he meant *immersion?*

Hear what President Beecher has said upon this passage. "Tertullian here traces the purifier, water, through all its uses in the heathen world in purifying, whether by sprinkling, or in any other way, for absolution, or for cleansing. And he sums it all up as the devil's *baptism.* Words denoting sprinkling, or purification, or absolution, pervade the whole passage, as lavacrum, lavatio, aspergio, purgo, expio, abluo, emundo, absolvo, diluo. But no word occurs denoting of necessity immersion. Dr. Carson may refer to *tingo.* I know that he has said, in his work on baptism, (p. 55,) 'Tingo expresses appropriately dipping and dyeing, and these only.' Dr. Carson says this with his usual accuracy. Ovid was of a different opinion. Speaking of the ocean in a storm, he says, 'videtur aspergine tingere nubes,' (Met. xi. 497, 498.) Did Ovid mean that 'the ocean seems to dye the clouds with spray,' or 'to immerse them with spray'? He means plainly 'to sprinkle them with spray.' He also uses the expression, 'tingere corpus aqua sparsâ.' (Fast. iv. 790. See Gesner on tingo.) Does this mean 'to *color* or to *immerse* the body by sprinkled water'? And what mean the common expressions, tingi nardo, tingi

Pallade, tingi oleo? Is oil a coloring substance? or was it customary to be dipped in oil? We read of anointing with oil, or of pouring oil on the head. Who has recorded the custom of dipping in oil? Hilarius too, on Acts xix. 4, speaking of a spurious baptism, says, 'non *tincti*, sed *sordidate* sunt.' Here the antithesis demands of us to translate, 'They were not *purified*, but *polluted*.' Tingo, then, means to sprinkle, to wet or moisten, to wash, to purify; and in reference to baptism this last is its appropriate sense. No word, then, occurs, denoting *immersion*. All kinds of purification and expiation are spoken of, including prominently those by *sprinkling*, and all are summed up as the devil's *baptism*, *i.e.* the devil's purification or absolution, and the closing contrast rests for all its force on assigning to the word this sense." (Baptism, its Import and Modes, pp. 165, 166.)

So again Tertullian (p. 357) says, speaking of the water and the blood, "*Hos duo baptismos de vulnere perfossi lateris emisit*," "these two baptisms he poured forth from the wound of his pierced side." Did he mean to say that Christ poured forth two immersions from his wounded side, or that he sent forth two purifications?

We therefore set down Tertullian, along with Clement, Cyril, Ambrose, and Justin Martyr, as a clear and decisive witness that, in its scriptural and Christian sense, *baptizo* does not mean mere immersion, but a religious washing, cleansing, or purification, even to the exclusion of immersion.

We turn next to Origen. In his Seventh Homily on the 6th of Judges, he says, "The outpouring of

his [Christ's] blood is denominated a *baptism.*" Who ever denominated the outpouring of Christ's blood an immersion? Would he not be denominated a *fool* who should apply to it such a term? It was not an immersion. It neither immersed Christ nor anybody else. Yet Origen approves of its being called a *baptism.* It was an expiation, a purgation of sin, a moral and judicial cleansing; and this is what was here meant by the word *baptism.*

The same Father, in his notes on Matt. xx. 21, 22, says again, "Martyrdom is rightfully called a *baptism.*" But is martyrdom a fluid in which one can be dipped? Can we conceive of an immersion in martyrdom? The ancients believed in a purification by martyrdom. They considered death endured for Christ an entire purgation of any defects or sins that may have attached to the man before his death. They regarded it as a *cleansing,* and hence called it a *baptism.* They never dreamed of regarding it as an immersion.

Again: in John i. 25, the Jews are represented as asking the forerunner of our Lord, "Why baptizest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" And the question is thus referred to by Origen in his comment:— "What makes you think that Elias when he comes will baptize, who, in Ahab's time, did not [himself] baptize the wood upon the altar, which required washing in order to be burnt up, when the Lord should reveal himself by fire? For he ordered the priests to do that [*i.e.* baptize the wood] not only once, for he says, 'Do it the

second time.'" Now, what was the transaction here referred to? We have it in 1 Kings xviii.:—"And Elijah took twelve stones, and with the stones he built an altar; and he made a trench about the altar. And he put the wood in order [on the altar, of course], and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels with water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood. And he said, Do it the second time. And they did it the second time. And he said, Do it the third time. And they did it the third time. And the water ran round about the altar." This is the entire and minute account. And what was it that Elijah commanded the priests to do? The answer is plain:—*to pour out water* upon the bullock, on the wood, on the altar, which was built of twelve stones and surrounded with a trench. The mode prescribed was *pouring upon*, and the circumstances demonstrate that the result could not have been immersion. Yet Origen pronounces it a *baptism*. We add Prof. Wilson's remarks upon this fact:—

"Let it be observed, we here come into contact with the most learned Greek Father, and one of the most accomplished Biblical scholars of the ancient Church. To tax such a witness with ignorance of the circumstances embraced in his evidence, or of the language in whose varied literature he stood so pre-eminent, would be extreme and unaccountable fatuity. Origen knew, as well as any modern Baptist knows, that Elijah commanded his attendants to fill the barrels with water and *pour it on the burnt sacrifice and on the*

wood. The author of the Hexapla had carefully studied his Bible, and entered profoundly and minutely into its different peculiarities of thought and forms of expression. How invaluable, then, is the testimony when a writer of such undoubted attainments identifies the command to *pour water upon the wood* with a command to *baptize!* Elijah did not himself baptize, for he ordered the priests to do that. To do what? To *pour water* on the wood upon the altar; and this, in the estimation of the most distinguished Greek Father, was *baptism!* Comment may succeed in diluting, but is incompetent to strengthen, the force of a testimony so decided and unexceptionable. That in regard to the meaning of baptism it utterly breaks away from the trammels of an exclusively modal application is clear as the noonday sun." (Infant Baptism, pp. 331, 332.)

But Dr. Fuller cannot give up his precious and refreshing *dip.* He asks, (p. 30,) "What was the idea in Origen's mind? *It was an immersion"!* Dr. Fuller says, "It was the complaint of a writer that his opponent did not know when a thing was proved." Will he just put a pin here and make the proper application of his remark?

In Routh's Reliquiæ Sacræ, vol. iii. p. 48, a passage occurs from Nicephorus, also one of the Greek Fathers, in which he describes a baptism. It is in these words:—"He [the man], expecting to die, asked to receive the water; *i.e.* to be baptized. And he *baptized* him, even upon his couch on which he lay." Did he immerse him lying on his bed? Yes, say our Baptist friends; for "*bap-*

tizo always means immerse." But in this they are much wiser than Nicephorus; for he says "he baptized him" in a specific manner, (*perichutheuta,*) "*by pouring upon, by* AFFUSION." There was no immersion about it; but this Greek Father says it was a *baptism.* Was he ignorant of what baptism meant?

In a paper ascribed to Athanasius, found in the works of John of Damascus, it is said that "John was baptized [*ebaptisthae*] by placing his hand on the divine head of his Master." Was he *immersed* by putting his hand on the Savior's head? If not, here is another baptism without immersion,—a perfect "dry dip." The writer meant to say that John was *purified, cleansed,* by his contact with Jesus; and that cleansing he expressed by the word *baptizo.*

Anastasius (*Biblo. Patrum,* vol. v. p. 958) speaks of baptism as poured into water-pots, and of water-pots as baptized by pouring baptism into them. Can immersion be poured? And he also speaks of this very transaction as a type of the baptism of the Gentiles. Did he mean that the Gentiles were to be immersed by pouring immersion upon them? Anastasius meant to say that these water-pots were *cleansed,* or *purified,* by pouring a purifier—that is, water—into them; and *baptizo* is his word for it. He used it to express purification and cleansing.

Eusebius (*Hist. Ecc.* lib. 6, cap. 4) says of a female catechumen who was burned before receiving water-baptism, "She received the *baptism which is by fire,* and departed from this life." Did

she receive the *immersion* which is by fire? Where do we read of any such patristic rite as that of immersion by fire? Eusebius evidently intended to say that she was *cleansed* or purified by her martyrdom; and, according to his understanding of the Greek, *baptizo* adequately expressed this meaning.

In the fiftieth canon of the Apostolic Constitutions, as they are called, the phrase *tria baptismata* occurs. On this Zonaras and Balsamon thought themselves called on to make a note to inform the reader that *in this case baptisma* means immersion. The words of Balsamon are, "It seems to me that *baptismata* is to be taken for immersions here." Indeed! Why, if it always means immerse and nothing else, both the note and this modest expression of opinion are quite out of place. Why stop to inform us that *baptizo* here, as it seemed to him, was to be taken for immersion if it never had any other meaning? These notes are proof that *immersion* was not its common meaning in Christian Greek, but a sense so remote as not likely to be at all hit on by a common Christian reader.

What shall we say, then, to these things? Is not the point made out and proven beyond all controversy that immersion is not the sense of *baptizo* in Christian Greek? We have shown that the religious washing of Penelope, and the wetting of the hands of Telemachus, and the lustrations of the Jews reclining on their couches, and the sprinkling of the ashes of a burnt heifer, and the sprinkling of a lamb's blood with a bunch of hyssop, are called *baptisms*, and given as types of the Chris-

tian sacrament of baptism. We have shown that the cleansing derived from the cross and death of the Savior, the purifying of the soul from anger, covetousness, envy, and hatred, the sprinklings of water in religious service by the heathen, the purgation of circumcision, the pouring out of Christ's blood, the supposed purification by martyrdom, the pouring out of water upon a sacrifice on the altar, the baptism of a man on his bed by affusion, the purification of John by touching Christ's head, the cleansing of pots by pouring water into them,—cases in which all idea of immersion is entirely excluded,—all are denoted by *baptizo* in one or the other of its forms, and that too by great Christian teachers in various periods of the early Church, most of whom were native Greeks, who must have known the meaning of the language which they spoke. Nay, we have shown that certain ancient Greek scholars thought it necessary to insert notes in a certain place to keep the reader advised that THERE *baptizo* meant immerse. And how any man can rise up in the face of all this and say that this word always means immersion, and never any thing else, is a thing which we know not how to understand. It is an awful stifling and suppression of the truth. And, if that is being "a Baptist *on principle*," may the Lord have mercy upon those who are Baptists "*in sectarianism and bigotry*"!

CHAPTER XI.

BAPTIZO IN THE NEW TESTAMENT—PRELIMINARY QUESTION.

We are now about to enter within the New Testament, to see what it can teach us about *baptizo* and its cognate words, and whether it furnishes any thing to prove that its specific and only meaning is immerse. But, before entering directly upon this department of our investigation, we desire to raise and explain a preliminary question, which enters into it very deeply, and by a proper understanding of which we will so clear our way as to be less subject to interruptions.

Most of the passages in the New Testament in which *baptizo* occurs, without reference to John's baptism or to the Christian sacrament, refer to the purifications and lustrations enjoined in the law of Moses. It therefore becomes exceedingly important to know exactly what those purifying ordinances of Moses were; for it is by the character of those Jewish rites that we are to determine the general signification of the words which the writers of the New Testament employ to designate them. If they were certainly and clearly nothing but total immersions, then the word *baptizo*, when used by the inspired penman to designate them, must

mean a total immersion and nothing else; and so, on the other hand, if they were simple expiations or legal purifications, most of which were to be performed by sprinkling, and the rest by simple washing or bathing, without reference to mode, then *baptizo*, when used to designate them, must take the general scope of purification as its great and leading idea, without being limited to sprinkling, perfusion, hand-washing, or immersing, but comprehending all these modes.

What, then, is the fact with reference to this matter? Dr. Fuller nowhere fairly meets this inquiry. He proceeds as if it were a thing entirely settled and universally agreed, that all the purifications of the Mosaic law, designated in the New Testament by *baptizo* and *baptismos*, were total immersions and nothing else. Here and there, as occasion seems to demand, and where nothing else would save his cause, he throws in a quotation or two from authors who had before them a very different subject of inquiry, and some of them from books which we fear he never saw, all to leave the impression upon his reader's mind that all these legal baptisms were clearly, decidedly, and on all hands admitted to be nothing but total immersions!

We propose, then, to brush away these cobwebs of a perverted erudition; and, in doing so, we will go at once to the high, pure, and infallible authority of God's own word, leaving Dr. Fuller with Maimonides and the Targums, groping his way amid the traditions of the elders, for the sake of which he is not the first to set aside the commandment of God.

We deny—and we challenge the production of *scriptural proof* to the contrary—that there is anywhere in the Mosaic ritual any law enjoining upon the Jews the necessity of *totally immersing themselves*. In all the five books of Moses, so far as we have learned, the Hebrew word for *immerse* (*thabal*) is not used in one single instance where the washing and purification of *persons* is enjoined, nor any other word of corresponding import. Dr. Carson is reluctantly compelled to admit this fact. "I admit," says he, "that the Hebrew modal verb is not used with respect to persons." (P. 443.) It follows, then, that no stronger word than the general term *rahatz* is used in the Jewish law for any of the lustrations of men therein enjoined.

This word *rahatz* is rendered in our English Bible by the word *wash*, sometimes *bathe*. Dr. Fuller admits and contends that the command to *wash* is not a command either to sprinkle, pour, or *dip;* that "it is a command to wash and nothing else;" and that "*washing is more than*, and may be performed without, *either sprinkling, or pouring, or dipping*." (P. 15.) We argue, then, as these Levitical baptisms were mere *washings* and nothing else, so far as God's injunction goes, they were not immersions, any more than sprinklings or any other special mode of purifying with water.

The word *bathe*, which occurs in a few cases in the English version of these laws of Levitical purifications, might at first seem to indicate that they were to be performed by immersion. But in the original the word is always *rahatz*, the same that is rendered *wash*. Neither does *bathe* necessarily

convey the idea of immersion. It is from the Saxon *bathian,* which means simply to *wash.* It contains no indication of mode. We may bathe by sprinkling, rubbing, or suffusion, as well as by plunging. We have many more shower-baths and sponge-baths than plunge-baths. To be *bathed in tears* certainly does not mean totally *immersed* in tears. To bathe a wound is not to *immerse* it, but to moisten it with lotion or to wash it.

Now, we assert that if any of these Levitical lustrations were total immersions and nothing else, that fact must be found in the Hebrew word *rahatz;* for this is the only word by which they are signified in all of those cases where the express mode of the purification is not given. This word is usually rendered *wash* in the English Bible. "How much of an ablution is properly implied by the term," Professor Bush remarks, "it is difficult to say. That *it does not* indicate a complete immersion of the body in water would seem evident from the fact that we read of no provision being made for such a rite, either in the holy place or in the court of the tabernacle." In the Septuagint it is sometimes rendered by *louo,* which, as we have seen, means simply to cleanse or wash, sometimes by *nipto,* which means hand-washing, and sometimes by *pluno,* which has only the general signification of wash, rinse, or wet. None of these words prescribe mode, and no more mean to immerse than they mean to pour upon, or to sprinkle, or to apply water in any other manner for the purpose of cleansing.

To obtain a clear conception of the meaning and

scope of *rahatz*, and to see how far it is from denoting immersion and nothing else, let the reader examine the following passages, in which it is used :—

"Let a little water, I pray you, be fetched, and *wash* [*rahatz*] your feet." (Gen. xviii. 4.)

"And he entered into his chamber and wept there; and he *washed* [*rahatz*] *his face* and went out." (Gen. xliii. 30, 31.)

"And thou shalt cut the ram in pieces and *wash* [*rahatz*] the inwards of him."—(Exodus xxix. 17.)

"I will *wash* [*rahatz*] my hands in innocency." (Isa. xxvi. 6.)

"Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean; *wash* [*rahatz*] me, and I shall be whiter than snow." (Ps. li. 7.)

"I have cleansed my heart in vain and *washed* [*rahatz*] *my hands* in innocency." (Ps. lxxiii. 13.)

"*Wash* [*rahatz*] ye; make you clean; put away the evil." (Isa. i. 16.)

"When the Lord shall have *washed away* [*rahatz*] the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof by the spirit of judgment and burning." (Isa. iv. 4.)

"O Jerusalem, *wash* [*rahatz*] thine heart from wickedness, that thou mayest be saved."—(Jer. iv. 14.)

"For though thou *wash* [*rahatz*] thee with nitre, and take thee much soap, yet thine iniquity is marked before me, saith the Lord." (Jer. ii. 22.)

And, if any one is not satisfied with these quota-

tions, let him take a Hebrew Concordance and trace this word through the whole of the Old Testament, and he will find that it is used over and over to denote the *washing of any thing*,—of the feet, hands, face, body, and mind,—and that without the remotest allusion to the mode in which it was to be done. It is a word which has in itself no reference to mode. It contemplates only *an effect* to be reached by the use of a fluid, without any regard to the manner of that use, whether by friction, pouring, sprinkling, soaking, or plunging.

We wish it, therefore, to be distinctly understood, and thoroughly impressed upon the mind, that this word *rahatz*, the meaning of which is simply to wash or cleanse, no matter in what mode, is THE WORD used by the Spirit of God in all those passages of the Mosaic law where *bathing* and *washing* are enjoined, and upon which Dr. Fuller relies so confidently as indicating immersion and nothing else. We insist that they were no more immersions than they were pourings, because the word which designates them means as much to pour upon as to immerse, and is as completely fulfilled by the one as by the other.

Such, then, is the exact state of the case with regard to those Levitical lustrations in which *bathing* is spoken of.

But, in addition to this argument from the word *rahatz*, we remark further that, under all those circumstances upon which Dr. Fuller dwells as establishing that these bathings were performed by immersion, we have positive proof that they

were *not* performed by immersion. Take the case of the young man spoken of in Tobit vi. 2. He was out upon a journey; he had encamped by the river-side; and (*katebe*) he *went down* to wash himself. This word *katebe*—he *went down*—is precisely the same, and used here under precisely the same circumstances, as in the case of Naaman and Philip and the eunuch, where Dr. Fuller lays so much stress upon it. It is a word in which he finds a world of force and argument when spoken with reference to an approach toward the water. Naaman (*katebe*) *went down* and washed in Jordan. Philip and the eunuch (*katebesan*) *went down* into the water. And this is to prove to us that they were immersed. Well, just so this young traveller (*katebe*) *went down* to wash in the Tigris. Did he immerse himself? Was the submersion of his body the mode in which his ablution was performed? Upon Dr. Fuller's argument we would say, most unquestionably, yes. But let us not be so hasty and confident in our conclusions. The record says, *katebe* PERIKLUSASTHAI, he went down and *washed himself all around;* just as a man would stand in a stream and throw the water up on all sides of his body and thoroughly rub himself clean.

Here, then, is a case to explain what the Jews understood by those injunctions of the law providing that persons should "wash their flesh," or "bathe themselves in water,"—a case where the circumstances were such that, if immersion had been contemplated, immersion certainly would have been performed,—a case which at once

breaks the force of Dr. Fuller's argument on the word *katebe*, and completely annihilates what he has built upon the word *bathe*. We care not whether the story be true or false: Tobit is not an inspired book; but its historical details may still be true. Whether it be fact or fiction, it is equally in point to illustrate the ideas, the manners, and the customs of the age in which it was written, and is of more value for such a purpose than the sayings of a thousand Rabbis of comparatively modern times.

And, in order that there may be no room for doubt upon the meaning of *periklusasthai*, (from *perikluzo*,) we adduce the following instances:—

Aristotle applies it to the washing of children:—*to paidion hudati perikluzein*, "*to wash the child all around with water.*"

It is used by Euripides to denote the washing of the body with water from the sea, where he applies *nipto* to the same operation,—*nipto*, according to Dr. Fuller's own authority, on page 21, denotes *hand-washing*, and not a total immersion.

In Lucian, V. H., 1, 31, it is applied to an object *wet* or *sprinkled on all sides with* SPRAY *by rapid motion in water.*

Plutarch uses *kluzo* to denote the cleansing of the system from bile by the use of purgative medicines; also, with the preposition (*apo*) from, to express the washing off of blood from armor that had been used in battle.

Pollux gives it as the synonym of *plunein*, *hruptein*, and *kathairein*, and their compounds with

dia, *apo*, and *ek*,—all of which is quite inconsistent with the idea of immersion.

And Stevens, Scapula, Ernesti, Hedericus, Passow, Donnegan, and, as far as we know, all the lexicographers, give *perikluzo* as the washing around the person or thing which is the subject, so as to effect the most thorough cleansing.

This young man, then, even when he was at the river-side, after (*katebe*) he *went down* as Naaman and the eunuch (*katebe*) *went down*, and that for the express purpose of purifying himself,—when every thing that Dr. Fuller relies on to prove an immersion was there,—*did not immerse himself*, but (*periklusasthai*) *with his hands thoroughly washed himself all around.*

So much for those Levitical purifications in which *washing* and *bathing* are concerned. But there were others, in which the mode is particularly designated. It appertains to our purpose to say a word or two about these.

And foremost and above all stands the great *catharism*, or expiation, of which we have an account in the twelfth chapter of Exodus, and which has been kept as an annual observance by the children of Israel for the last three thousand years. Ambrose, as we have seen, calls it *a baptism.* It was a holy ordinance of expiation, cleansing from sin and exempting from death, as it pointed to the great spiritual purgation effected by the blood-shedding of that Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. It was ordained as a statute forever among the generations of Israel. It pointed back to their redemption from Egypt and its

destruction, and forward to that still more glorious expiation effected by Jesus on the cross. It was among all the Jewish rites by eminence a *catharism*, a cleansing, a covering up and washing away of sin. A more striking case of absolution is not contained in the ancient Scriptures. How, then, was it to be performed? Will any one pretend to say that there was any bathing, washing, or immersion about it? A spotless lamb was to be slain, and its blood was to be struck or sprinkled upon the lintel and side-posts of the door. God saw those stains of blood and was satisfied; and the hand of destruction and death was restrained as it passed.

One of the greatest uncleannesses among the Jews was the dreadful disease of leprosy. God also gave them special laws to be observed in purifying themselves from it. This constituted one of their most solemn purifications. And so far as the official and social act of this purification, as performed by an administrator, was concerned, it was done solely by *sprinkling* upon the subject the blood of a turtle-dove or pigeon. (See Lev. xiv.)

Another uncleanness under the Mosaic law was contact with the dead. The mode of its purgation is also clearly given:—"They shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel; and a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water, and *sprinkle* it upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave." (Num. xix. 17, 18.)

Another of the Levitical purifications was that at the ordination and induction of the Levites to the office of priests. In Numbers viii. 3, 7 the mode of doing it is explicitly given:—"Take the Levites and *cleanse* them. And thus shalt thou do unto them to cleanse them: *Sprinkle water of purifying upon them.*" Cyprian, in his sixty-ninth epistle, also adduces this very passage in proof of what is the scriptural mode of baptism. (Oxford, 1844, p. 228.)

As to the other and more familiar lustrations of the Jews, a correct idea of the mode of their performance may be obtained from what is said in John ii. 6, in the account of the miracle at the marriage in Cana:—"And there were set there *six water-pots of stone*, AFTER THE MANNER OF THE PURIFYING OF THE JEWS, *containing two or three firkins apiece.*" Surely, if "*the manner of the purifying of the Jews*" was adequately provided for in a few water-jars, the contents of which could be entirely drunk up by way of a supplement to a wedding-feast, those purifications were, at any rate, not performed by *immersion*. An allusion to the mode of these ordinary ablutions is also found in 2 Kings iii. 11, where Elisha is characterized as he "who POURED *water on the hands of Elijah;*" *i.e.* the servant who assisted the prophet in his purifications.

We also deem it worthy of remark that, in that Orient world where customs never change, we still find some remains of these ceremonial purifications and of the manner in which they were performed. The Mussulman, seated on the edge of his sofa, has a vessel placed before him on a large

red cloth. A servant on the right pours out the water for his master's use, and another on the left stands ready with the drying-towel. The devotee begins the service by bareing his arms to the elbows. He applies the water to his hands, mouth, nostrils, and forehead, repeating his prayers. He then rises up under the belief that he is *pure.* May not this also throw light upon "*the manner of the purifying of the Jews,*" from whom Mahomet and his people borrowed so many of their sacred ceremonies?

Such, then, were the *catharisms* and lustrations prescribed in the Levitical code and performed by the Jews in the Savior's time. If there were any others performed in any way different from those which we have named, we should like to have them pointed out to us, not from Maimonides, who lived but 650 years ago, or from Vatablus, who may still be giving Hebrew lessons to the students of Paris, but from the laws of Moses or from authentic records written by men cotemporaneous with Christ and his apostles. We do not pretend to deny, indeed, that many of these Levitical ablutions, when every thing else was convenient and favorable, were perhaps performed by immersion. This may have been; and thus we would account for the sayings of those men whom Dr. Fuller has quoted in his book. But we do most positively deny that a total immersion of the body was an essential part of any of them, whilst many of them were, by express injunction of God, to be performed *by sprinkling alone.*

We have already detained the reader longer

upon this point than we designed; but the great importance of it in determining the New Testament use of *baptizo* and its derivative *baptismos*, will readily be seen. It is with reference to these rites that these words are used. The nature of these rites must therefore determine the meaning of these words. And what shall be said of Dr. Fuller's theory that "*baptizo* denotes a total immersion and has no other meaning," when we make it appear that Paul, by inspiration of God, sums up all these ancient catharisms and lustrations as so many different BAPTISMS?

Let the reader turn, then, to the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews. The sacred writer there sets out to give an account of the rites and ceremonies of the Mosaic law. He is talking of these rites and ceremonies, not as they applied to cups and pots and other inanimate things, but as they applied to the persons of the worshipers and of their efficacy to "make perfect as pertaining to the conscience." He mentions expressly the legal abstinences and offerings, the sprinkling of the blood of expiation by the priest, and the sprinkling of the ashes of a heifer upon the unclean. And in verse 10 he takes them all up in one mental grasp and finds them all comprehended *monon epi bromasi kai pomasi*, KAI DIAPHOROIS BAPTISMOIS; that is to say, "*only in meats, and drinks, and* DIVERS BAPTISMS."

Here we have it, plain, unequivocal, staring every man full in the face, that, with the exception of distinctions in meats and drinks, the whole round of the Levitical purifications, from the

sprinkling of blood by the high-priest in the holy of holies to the sprinkling of the ashes of the burnt heifer on the bodies of the unclean, "*stood only in,*" and by inspiration of the great God himself are called, BAPTISMS—*diaphorois baptismois.*

What can be clearer than this? What more conclusive? Is it not demonstration itself?

CHAPTER XII.

BAPTIZO IN THE NEW TESTAMENT—JEWISH LUSTRATIONS.

We have now shown that the purifications and expiations enjoined in the Jewish law were not immersions, but either *sprinklings* or simple *washings,* ordinarily performed under circumstances where immersion was quite out of the question. We have also seen that the inspired writer in Hebrews sums up all these Levitical purifications in the one word *baptisms.* We can conceive of no stronger proof to show that this word does not and cannot always mean immerse and nothing else. The sprinkling of the blood of the paschal lamb on the doors certainly was not an immersion; neither was the sprinkling of the ashes of the red heifer on the unclean an immersion. The sprinkling of the blood of a young pigeon upon the recovering leper was not an immersion. The cleansing of the Levites by sprinkling "water of purifying upon

them" was not an immersion. Elisha's pouring of water on the hands of Elijah was not an immersion. "The manner of the purifying of the Jews," as indicated by the "six water-pots of stone," in which the Savior's first miracle was wrought, was not by immersion. And even those more thorough washings of the flesh and bathings, all of which are denoted by the word *rahatz,* were not necessarily immersions any more than hand-washings. It is a fact, which cannot be denied, that there is not a personal immersion required in all the Mosaic law. There were, however, many lustrations and cleansings enjoined; and in most of these the mode also was given in the same law that enjoined them. That mode was *sprinkling.* And yet, in the New Testament, inspired authority calls them all *baptisms.*

Besides, the very epithet which the apostle uses to describe these baptisms shows that he did not mean immersions. He denominates them *diaphorois,—different, diverse,* distinguishable the one from the other. An immersion is an immersion; and one immersion for purification is just like all other immersions for purification. Such immersions were not *diverse* or *various,* either in act, in circumstances, or in end. One is a perfect *fac-simile* of the other. There is no diversity about them. But the baptisms of which the apostle is speaking he characterizes expressly as *diaphorois baptismois*—DIVERS BAPTISMS. If he meant *divers immersions,* they that so understand him are bound to show the diversity. They have never done it; and, taking the word in that sense, they never can do

it. But, taking *baptisms* here in the wider and more natural sense of *katharizo*,—to purify and expiate,—the diversity spoken of is at once obvious. Some were performed by the use of blood, some by the use of ashes, and others by the use of water. In some the performance was by sprinkling, in some by hand-washing, in others by pouring water on the hands, and perchance in a few cases by immersion. This forms the variety. And still they were all baptisms. The sprinklings with ashes were *baptisms*, expressly so called by Cyril of Alexandria, who lived within a few hundred years of the apostles; and the sprinklings with blood were *baptisms*, so more than once declared by Ambrose, who lived still nearer to the apostolic age; and the various lustrations, including the washing of hands and other water-applications, were *baptisms*, so pronounced by Clement of Alexandria, who lived within one hundred years of the death of St. John; and all of them together were *baptisms*, so declared by authority which could not err, even by the inspired writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Is it not as plain then as language can make it that they were *baptisms*, not because they were immersions, for they were not immersions, but *baptisms* in the only true religious sense of the word, because they were *purifications?*

In Mark vii. 4 we have another instance of the use of *baptizo* in which we must assign to it this same signification. "And when they come from the market, except they *wash* [*baptisontai*] they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the *washing* [*bap-*

tismous] of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels, and *tables.*"

Dr. Fuller's position is, that "an *entire* immersion belongs to the nature of baptism;" that "*baptizo* contains the idea of a *complete* immersion under water;" that "it *always denotes a total immersion.*" (Pp. 19, 23.) Of course, then, if his position is true, it must hold good in this case; and when it is said that the Pharisees never eat after returning from the market until *they have baptized* themselves, it must mean that they *totally immersed* themselves. Did they, then, totally immerse themselves? He quotes fourteen authorities on this point: quite a formidable array, surely. But two of these very authorities, in the very passages quoted, speak only of *washings,* without saying one word about the mode in which they were to be done; and seven more of these same authorities—Campbell, Buxtorf, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Kuinol, Spencer, and Lightfoot—say most explicitly that these Pharisaic purifications after return from market were only washings *of the hands!* So that seven out of twelve of his own witnesses, and those the most reliable, positively declare that these Pharisaic baptisms *were not total immersions,* but *hand-washings.*

Nor will it meet the case for Dr. Fuller to say or to *prove* that these hand-washings were immersions of the hands. The *baptisms* are predicated of "*the Pharisees and all the Jews,*" not of *the hands* of the Pharisees and Jews. "And when *they* come from the market, except THEY wash [*baptisontai*] *they* eat not." The *baptism* is the baptism of the same that went to market, that returned

from market, and that ate. The same nominative stands for all these verbs. Certainly it was not *the hands alone* that went to market, nor the hands alone that returned from market, nor the hands alone that ate. "The Pharisees and all the Jews" constitute the subject of whom these things are alleged; and Dr. Fuller can no more exempt all but *hands* from the force of *baptisontai* than he can exempt all but *hands* from the eating and returning from market. It was the Pharisees that ate, and the Pharisees that returned from market, and it was the Pharisees that *baptized themselves.* And so, if that baptism was performed by a simple washing of the hands, no matter whether they were steeped in water, or whether water was poured, or sprinkled, or rubbed upon them, it was not a total immersion; and *baptizo* here must take the sense of *purify,* and not that of entire immersion under water.

But what is to be done with Dr. Fuller's five remaining authorities, in which it is said that the Pharisees totally immersed themselves before eating, after having been at the market? Whether he has quoted them fairly we have not attempted to ascertain. All we have to say on that point is, that a man who can take the liberties with the Book of God—a book in every one's hand—which we have proven upon Dr. Fuller, is not very much to be relied on when he comes to give a line or two here and there from rare books, which the most intelligent men seldom see. But we will suppose these quotations all accurate and just. What do they amount to? Two of them—one from Maimo-

nides and one from Vatablus—say not a word about the market, and may refer to a very different department of Pharisaic lustrations from that alluded to in the text. But we pass this also, and permit them all to stand as going directly to the point. And yet we can satisfactorily meet them all without travelling out of Dr. Fuller's own book. Seven of his own authorities, and the very best out of the twelve that he has quoted in this place, flatly contradict, confound, and completely negative the other five, and, in words as positive as can be chosen, declare that these Pharisaic purifications after attending market *were not total immersions*, but *hand-washings*. Are not *seven* an adequate offset to *five?* Are not Buxtorf, Wetstein, Rosenmüller, Kuinol, Spencer, and Lightfoot names as great and controlling as Vatablus, Grotius, Maimonides, and Macknight? According to one list, the baptism before us was an immersion of the whole body,—a *total* immersion; according to the other list, it was a mere washing of the hands; according to a third list, it was a simple washing, without specification of mode: and all the lists are Dr. Fuller's own quotations! Let him harmonize his authorities if he can, and then perhaps they may be of some weight. If these purifications from the contaminations of the market-place were mere *washings*, they may have been immersions, or they may have been sprinklings or rubbings. If they were mere hand-washings, they certainly were not total immersions; and the great weight of his authorities goes to establish that they were mere hand-washings and nothing else.

Now, we do not intend to maintain that these Pharisaic lustrations from the supposed defilement of attending market were never performed by a general bathing, or even by a total immersion. The probability is, that in the warm season, and when circumstances made it convenient, they did at times perform this particular purification in one or the other of these ways. No sensible man will deny that such instances may have occurred. And this will sufficiently account for what has been said by Maimonides, Grotius, and Macknight. But we do maintain that this was not the only nor the ordinary way of performing this purification. The seven authorities quoted by Dr. Fuller, which declare that it was done by the mere washing of the hands, is proof enough to our purpose. But we will not stop with what they have said. Our author seems to think that authorities are arguments; and therefore we will not withhold them.

The commentator Henry remarks upon the customs of the Jews as related to this passage, "They particularly *washed* before they ate bread. They took special care, when they came from the markets, *to wash their hands.* The rule of the Rabbins was, that if they washed their hands well in the morning it would serve for all day, provided they kept alone; but if they went into company they must not eat or pray till they had washed their hands."

Scott says, "It seems undeniable that by the words *baptize* and *baptism, a partial application of water* was intended in this as in several other places."

Dr. Schaff, in his History of the Apostolic Church, p. 569, says, "In support of this [that *baptizo* has the general sense *to wash, to cleanse*] a confident appeal can assuredly be made to several passages, —viz., Luke xi. 38, with Mark vii. 2, 4, where *baptizien is used of the washing* OF HANDS *before eating.* Mark has for this (v. 3) *niptein*, which, in the East, was performed *by pouring.*" The same author says that in Mark vii. 4, 8, Heb. ix. 10, "*Baptismoi* must be taken to include *all sorts of religious purifications among the Jews, including* SPRINKLING."

Bloomfield says that *baptizo* here DOES NOT *denote an immersion.*

In Morris and Smith's Exposition of the Gospels we have this note upon this passage:—"They [the Jews] did not immerse themselves in water, but used a small quantity, which was applied to the hand and wrist, or, at most, to the arm as far as the elbow. *It cannot be proved that the Jews washed the whole body when they returned from market.* There could have been no necessity for it, even in their opinion. The most they did was to wash those parts which were exposed to contamination."

Rosenmüller says, "The sense is, 'when they come from the market (*i.e. any public place*) they do not take their food except *they wash their hands.*'"

Dr. Dick says, "The *baptizing* after return from market probably signifies the same thing with *washing their hands,* as it is very improbable that on every such occasion they washed the whole body." (Theol. vol. ii. p. 375.)

Albert Barnes says, "*Baptize,* in this place, *does*

not mean to immerse the whole body. There is no evidence that the Jews immersed their whole bodies every time they came from the market. It is probable they washed as a mere ceremony, and often, doubtless, with the use of a very small quantity of water."

And in the notes to the Cottage Bible it is said that some of the wealthier, who had the leisure and all the necessary conveniences, may have immersed themselves, but that the generality of the Jews did no more than wash *their hands.*

It may be said that these are all modern authorities. Be it so: we will give some more ancient. The oldest given by Dr. Fuller carries us back to the close of the twelfth century. Theophylact lived more than a hundred years earlier, and is pronounced by Mosheim and Neander the most distinguished exegetical writer of his age; and Theophylact says that these Jewish purifications before eating were performed by mere *hand-washings.* He designates them by the word *niptesthai,*—a word which, according to Beza, (as quoted by Dr. Fuller himself,) has respect *only to the hands.*

But we go back six hundred years further still. We point Dr. Fuller to the oldest but one, if not the very oldest, existing copy of the Bible itself,—to a manuscript of the New Testament which, for its internal excellence and nearest approach to the older Greek copies, was preferred by Michaelis to all others,—to *the Codex Vaticanus.* We point him also to eight other ancient copies, as also to Euthemius the Isaurian,—*all of which have* RANTISONTAI in the place of *baptisontai.* "When they

come from the market, except *they* SPRINKLE *themselves* they eat not." And, surely, if the old Greek transcribers thirteen hundred years ago considered the word *baptism* in this passage as the proper equivalent of *sprinkling*, it ought to settle the case. If Dr. Fuller really entertains the reverence for authority which he professes, let him bow before it and confess that *baptizo* does not here mean a total immersion and nothing else.

But "the Pharisees and all the Jews" not only baptized or purified *themselves;* they had also received to hold many like things, such as "the *baptizing* or *purifying* [*baptismous*] of cups and pots, brazen vessels, *and of tables.*" As to these cups, pots, and brazen vessels, they may have been immersed or not, as circumstances rendered convenient. We suppose they ordinarily were immersed, because this was the most convenient and natural mode of purifying them. Anastasius, however, gives us instances in which such vessels were purified simply by pouring water into them, and calls such a purification *baptism.* (*Biblo. Patrum*, vol. v. p. 958.) According to the laws, the purification of polluted vessels was performed in divers ways, as may be seen from Levit. vi. 28, xv. 12, xi. 32.

But what shall be said of the *"tables"?* Dr. Fuller tells us not to think of "our massive mahogany furniture," and wishes to make his readers believe that nothing more is meant than *"a round piece of leather"!* (P. 60.) Professor Curtis of Lewisburg, Pa., differs from him, and tells us it was *"a cotton quilt"!* (P. 194.) And, by the time our

Baptist friends get through with their investigations, there is no telling what it will not mean. But, if Dr. Fuller had given attention to the authority which he quotes in the very next paragraph of his book, he would have found a hint which would have saved him his "round piece of leather."

Maimonides says, "Every vessel *of wood* which is made for the use of man, as a TABLE, receives defilement." After all, it seems that a Jewish "*table*" was made "*of wood*," and that it was a very different thing from "a round piece of leather, spread upon the floor, upon which is placed a sort of stool, supporting nothing but a platter." How "*massive*" Dr. Fuller's "mahogany furniture" may be, we know not. He claims to be something out of the ordinary line of Baptists, and advocates a system very different from that held by the great majority of Christians; and it may be that his "mahogany furniture" is also something out of the common order of things. But we do know that, especially among the wealthier Pharisees,—the very parties concerned in the passage before us,—the "tables" in use were cumbersome *wooden* structures, from eight to twenty feet in length, about four feet wide, and about three or four feet high. (See Watson's Dictionary, art. "Banquet;" Horne's Introduction, vol. ii. part 4, ch. 1, sec. 4; and Comprehensive Commentary on John xiii. 23, 25.) And whether such articles were ordinarily submerged in water after every meal we ask the reflecting to judge.

But the word *klinon*, here rendered *tables*, does

not properly mean the tables on which food was placed, but the *couches, sofas, and cushions* on which the guests reclined whilst eating. Dr. Fuller becomes very impatient under this fact, and says, "*I don't care what it means. The Bible says they immersed the articles; and this is enough.*" (P. 61.) Take it easy, Doctor: the Bible says no such thing. That awkward and equivocal Latin word *immerse* is not in the Bible, and never will be there until Baptists are allowed to carry into effect that cherished wish of their hearts,—to wit, the adjustment of the word of God to their miserable sectarian system. The word *klinon* means *couches or beds,* and the Bible says that the Jews *baptized* them; and we wish the reader to inquire into the character of these articles, in order to make up his mind as to whether that baptism was a total immersion. What were these couches? The learned Horne thus refers to them:—"The more opulent had (as those in the East still have) fine carpets, couches, or divans, and sofas, on which they *sat, lay, and slept.* In later times their couches were splendid, and the frames inlaid with ivory, and the coverlets rich and perfumed. On these sofas, in the latter ages of the Jewish State, [the very period to which this text relates,] they universally reclined when taking their meals, resting on their side with their heads toward the table." (Int. vol. ii. p. 154.)

Smith, in his Dictionary of Antiquities, says, "The *klinæ* is, properly speaking, only the bedstead, and seems to have consisted of posts fitted into one another, resting upon four feet. It was

generally made of wood, solid or veneered, and sometimes had silver feet."

Watson thus describes them:—"Round the tables were placed beds or couches, one to each table: each of these beds was called *clinium*. At the end of each *clinium* was a footstool, for the convenience of mounting up to it. These beds were formed of mattresses and supported on frames of wood, often highly ornamented. The mattresses were covered with cloth or tapestry, according to the quality of the entertainer." (Theol. Dict. art. "Banquet.") Even Mr. Carson, one of Dr. Fuller's guides, freely concedes that such were the articles denoted by *klinon*. Upon these couches, too, Clement tells us that it was the custom of the Jews often to be *baptized*. And can any sober-minded man suppose that such "*splendid*" articles were subject to daily immersions, and, above all, with men reclining on them? If not, then *baptizo* here signifies only to *purify*, and that in some mode less troublesome and less destructive than that of quite burying them in the water.

Lightfoot maintains that the baptism of the couches was by *sprinkling*.

Another passage in which *baptizo* occurs is Luke xi. 38:—"A certain Pharisee besought Jesus to dine with him; and Jesus went in and sat down to meat. And when the Pharisee saw it he marvelled that Jesus had not first *washed* [*ebaptisthe*] before dinner." Here we have the same sort of purification spoken of in the preceding passage. Smith, in his Antiquities, in describing a Grecian dinner, says, "After the guests had placed themselves on

the *klinai*, the slaves brought in water *to wash their hands.*" The custom was doubtless the same in Judea and in Greece. Nay, if the Jewish lustrations were ordinarily performed by simply washing their hands, even when returning from the market, it certainly is not to be supposed in this case that Christ was expected to *immerse* himself. Kuinol says that the existence of any such custom as that of regular immersion before all meals cannot be proved. Henry, Burkitt, and Olshausen understand mere hand-washing to be indicated. The translators Wickliffe, Tyndale, Luther, Cranmer, the learned authors of King James's version, the editors of the Geneva Bible, the Rheims version, and even the version given out by the distinguished champion of immersionism, Alexander Campbell, all render it in this place by the general word *wash.* Scapula, Schœtgen, Hedericus, Schleusner, Parkhurst, Robinson, and Ewing, all refer in their lexicons to this, along with other passages, as an instance in which the word can mean nothing more than simply to *wash* or *cleanse.* It denotes no more than a common ceremonial purification, which was sufficiently accomplished by a simple wetting of the hands.

May we not say, then, in view of these facts and evidences, that it is proven that in the New Testament *baptizo* has a different meaning from that of mere immersion? Who can doubt?

We would ask the reader to consider also, in this connection, that the proper Greek words for immersion—*katapontizo, katadumi, katabaptizo,* and *dupto*—are never once used by the sacred writers

in connection with the sacrament of baptism or any religious cleansing. Why is this? They everywhere and always have the very *"univocal meaning"* which immersionists assign to *baptizo.* What, then, is the reason that the inspired penmen have never used one of them with reference to baptism? Is not the omission significant? Has not this divine particularity, in using only *baptizo,* a lesson for us? Does it not teach us that there is a peculiarity about the meaning of this word something different from the simple act of immersion?

CHAPTER XIII.

BAPTIZO IN THE NEW TESTAMENT—ITS TRUE MEANING.

Our doctrine is that *baptizo,* with its derivatives, in the vocabulary of the New Testament, is a *religious word,* and, wherever literally used, is used in the same distinct *religious sense.* Dr. Carson concedes that "its occurrence in profane writers is very rare." (P. 20.) And they never used it in a strictly religious sense. It is "one of those words whose history it is peculiarly interesting to watch, as they obtain a deeper meaning and receive a new consecration in the Christian Church, which, even while it did not invent, has assumed them into its service and employed them in a far loftier sense than any to which the world had ever put

them before." (Trench's Synonyms, p. 17.) If it meant to immerse and nothing else, it would unquestionably have been somewhere interchanged with other Greek words which have this specific signification. It is never so interchanged. Dr. Fuller agrees that "the Holy Spirit *always*, in speaking of the ordinance [of baptism], uses one single word: that word is *baptizo*." (P. 12.) This fact is very significant. It shows conclusively that this word is not the synonym of *dupto*, *katapontizo*, *katadumi*, *katabaptizo*, or any other word that has the specific signification of sinking under water, but has a sense peculiarly and pre-eminently *its own*,—not one up to the time foreign and unknown to this word, but one among its well-known significations, now adopted, fixed, and ever after adhered to as the *specific sense* in which the Holy Ghost employs it.

Dr. Fuller affects to be filled with holy jealousy at such a doctrine. Though its truth is so distinctly indicated by the *acts* of the Holy Spirit, he does not condescend to pay it common respect. He will not call it "amusing absurdity" and "ridiculous sophistry:" the subject is "too solemn" for that. It is presented as something with horns and split hoofs; a black spirit from the under-world, bearing the name of blasphemy; "AN IMPIETY *which ought to fill a pious mind with horror*"! (P. 32.) But harsh exclamations, and the application of evil names, are not arguments. With all Dr. Fuller's "hue and cry" about absurdity, sophistry, and *horrible impiety*, we maintain that *baptizo has a religious sense*,—a peculiar,

settled, and specific religious signification. And so have nearly all the translators believed, and acted on that belief. Jerome, Beza, the author of the old Italic version, Wickliffe, Tindale, Cranmer, the Geneva Bible, and King James's translators, have all transferred the word without translating it, except in one or two instances in which it applies to religious *washings*. Horrible impietists these must have been, to agree that *baptizo* in the Savior's lips was a word so peculiar in its application as not to be capable of an exact translation by any one verb either in Latin, Italic, or English! Hedericus assigns it a specific religious sense in his lexicon. Parkhurst, Schleusner, Robinson, and others do the same. And an able critic, in the "Congregational Magazine," some years ago, gave an argument, which Dr. Carson failed to set aside, proving "that the context of the word in the New Testament is never that which is used, both in the classics and in the Scriptures, to connect verbs signifying to dip with that into which any object is dipped; but, on the contrary, the context is always of a kind which proves that literally it means some effect produced by water. Where *bapto* and *baptizo* signify to dip, the context is *eis*, with that into which the object is dipped,—as we should say, he dipped *into* water, &c. But *this construction does not once occur in the use of baptizo in the Septuagint and the New Testament.*" Even Carson himself admits that immersion and baptism are not synonymous words. He says that they "are any thing rather than synonymous." (P. 383.) The testimony,

therefore, is perfectly conclusive, that *baptizo* in the New Testament is used in a somewhat peculiar way; that it is a religious word, with its own distinct religious sense.

We have just argued that *baptizo* was not used by the inspired writers to signify a total immersion and nothing else, because they have never used it interchangeably with other words which have this specific signification. Upon the same principle we argue that, if an instance can be found in which the sacred penmen use it interchangeably with any other word, that word must give its true scriptural, religious sense, its proper, technical, New Testament signification. Have we any such instance? We have.

Let the reader turn to John iii. 22 and read from that on to John iv. 3. The apostle here tells us that John the Baptist was baptizing at Enon, and that Jesus was also engaged in baptizing—at least, by his disciples—in the same vicinity. John had been baptizing great multitudes; but it seems that at this time the public attention was somewhat diverted from John's baptism to that of the Savior. A sort of jealousy was engendered in some of John's disciples by this turn in the current of popular favor, and they began to speak of it. A dispute arose about the relative merits of John's baptism and Christ's baptism. And this dispute about *baptism* the sacred writer terms "a question *peri* KATHARISMOU,"—*about* PURIFYING. Of course, it could not have been a question about purification in general: that is altogether foreign to the scope of the

passage. It was *baptism* that gave rise to the dispute; and *baptism* was the subject with which the disputants, on the one side at least, went to John to complain. (John v. 26.) It necessarily follows, therefore, that the subject of their dispute was *baptism*. Chrysostom, Gregory of Nyssa, and Cyril of Alexandria, testify expressly, in commenting upon this passage, that the question concerning *purification* was simply and only a question concerning *baptism*. Theophylact says of John's disciples and the Jews on this occasion that they "disputed concerning purification; *that is, baptism.*" Olshausen says, "The dispute related to *baptism.*" Dr. Beecher says, "The dispute in question was plainly a specific dispute concerning *baptism* as practiced by Jesus and John." Schleusner, Wahl, Vater, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Bretschneider, and Kuinol, all say that baptism was the only subject of the question. Grotius, Beza, Whitby, Doederline, Burkitt, Clarke, and Henry take the same view. Rosenmüller, Vater, Kuinol, and Schleusner give *baptism* as the proper translation of *katharismou* in this passage. Even Professor Ripley himself, nay, all that have ventured to comment upon this text, so far as we know, Mr. Carson alone excepted, in some way or other make *katharismou* here mean *baptism*. By no just laws of interpretation can it be made to mean any thing else. And, whether we put *baptism* in the place of the word *purifying*, or put *purify* in the place of *baptize*, the sense remains the same.

Here, then, is a divine key to unlock to us the

true religious sense of *baptizo*. By inspiration of the Holy Ghost it has its equivalent and synonym in *katharizo*, which means to *purify*. The dispute of which the apostle speaks was not a dispute about "a total immersion and nothing else," but a dispute about *purifying*. That purifying was the religious rite of *baptism* as practiced both by Christ and his forerunner. It follows, therefore, with inevitable certainty,—and that not from heathen classics or modern Jewish paraphrasts, but from the infallible word of God itself,—that the true religious sense of *baptizo is religious* PURIFICATION. If this is "*horrible impiety*," let Dr. Fuller make the most of it.

Another word given in the Scriptures as equivalent to *baptizo* is *dikaioo*, to clear, justify, to declare innocent, and hence also to purify. In Hebrews ix. 10 the writer makes *diaphorois baptismois* (divers baptisms) the exact equivalent of *dikaiomasi sarkos* (clearings of the flesh). He is speaking of the external expiations and lustrations prescribed in the Jewish law. He calls them all *baptisms;* and these outward baptisms he calls *clearings* or *purifyings* of the flesh. It is true, in the English Bible the word "*and*" comes between these two expressions, as if the writer designed to designate two distinct departments in the legal services of which he is speaking. But Griesbach altogether rejects this "*and*" (*kai*), as not a genuine reading. Professor Stuart takes the same view, and renders the passage "*meats and drinks and divers washings* [*baptisms*],—*ordinances pertaining to the flesh*." The Syriac version, according to

Murdock's translation of it, is very clear in this view. After the reference to meats and drinks and baptisms, it has this unequivocal phrase:—"WHICH WERE *carnal ordinances.*" In a tract before us, from a doctor of divinity in the city of Baltimore, the passage is rendered "*meats and drinks and* DIVERS BAPTISMS, [EVEN] JUSTIFICATIONS [or purifications] *of the flesh.*" Dr. Carson agrees that *kai* "often signifies *even.*" (P. 69.) And it is evident to all who will examine that this *must* be the true reading, because there are no justifications or purifyings of the flesh prescribed in all the Jewish law which are not completely included "in meats and drinks and divers baptisms." *Baptismois* and *dikaiomasi* are therefore interchangeable terms. At least the Holy Ghost employs the one to explain the other. *Dikaioma* nowhere, to our knowledge, means immersion or any thing like it. It means a judicial clearing. In Rom. ii. 26, v. 18, viii. 4, and Rev. xix. 8, it is rendered *righteousness;* in many places, *justify;* in Rom. vi. 7, *freed.* All these are also meanings of *katharizo.* And, if these words explain the meaning of *baptizo,* a religious purifying is certainly its sense. There can be no escape from this argument.

Again: in 1 Cor. xii. 13 the Holy Ghost himself is presented as a *baptizer*:—"For *by one Spirit* we are all BAPTIZED [*ebaptisthamen*]." Is the Holy Spirit an *immerser* or *plunger?* No; the Holy Spirit is a *sanctifier,* a *purifier.* (Ezek. xxxvii. 28; Rom. xv. 16; 1 Pet. i. 2.) "The baptism of the Holy Ghost," says Brown, "denotes not only the miraculous collation of the influences of the blessed

Spirit, whereby the New Testament Church was solemnly consecrated to the service of God, but *chiefly* his gracious influences, which, like fire, *purify*, soften, and inflame our heart with love to Jesus, and wash away our sin, and enable us to join ourselves to him and his people." When, therefore, the fulfillment of these offices of the Holy Ghost upon the recovered sinner is called *baptism*, are we not bound to interpret the word according to the nature of the offices and work of the Holy Spirit? If the office of the Holy Ghost is to *purify*, and God calls that purification *baptism*, is it not a clear and palpable demonstration that in God's mouth the terms are convertible, and that *baptizo* in its proper religious sense means *purification?*

There is also a passage in the first chapter of John, verses 19–28, which remains exceedingly obscure until we give to *baptizo* its proper signification of *purify*. The authorities of the Jewish people sent a deputation to John the Baptist, to ascertain from him his true official character and position. They asked him whether he was Elijah, mistaking as they did the true import of the prediction in Malachi iv. 5, 6. John said he was not. They asked him whether he was that prophet foretold by Moses in Deuteronomy xviii. 15. He answered again he was not. They then asked him, "*Why* BAPTIZEST [*baptizeis*] *thou, then, if thou be not the Christ nor Elijah, neither that prophet?*" What does this mean? What had been said by the ancient prophets concerning Christ and his forerunner, that led the Jewish officials to suppose

that these predictions were verified in John's work of *baptizing?* Had God's messenger been predicted as an *immerser?* No. Had Christ been predicted as an *immerser?* No. In what peculiar character, then, had they been predicted, to give rise to this singular question? One passage in Malachi iii. 1–3 will solve the whole difficulty. In that passage the Savior is foretold as a PURIFIER, likened to "a refiner's fire and fuller's soap," who should "sit *as a refiner and* PURIFIER of silver," who should "PURIFY *the sons of Levi* and *purge them* as gold and silver." See also Isa. i. 25, iv. 4; Zech. xiii. 9; Matt. iii. 10, 12; and Lightfoot's large collection of Rabbinical passages on this point. According to these prophecies, the Jews universally expected both Elijah and Christ in the official character of PURIFIERS. And when they put the question to John, why he *baptized* if he was neither Christ nor Elijah, they doubtless used the word in the sense of the prophecies which led them to ask the question, and the nature of the case requires us to assign it the only intelligible sense of *purification.*

There are yet a couple of passages which at least approach a definition of baptism, to which we invite attention. The one is Eph. v. 26, the other is Titus iii. 5. That these texts refer directly to baptism is agreed by the best interpreters, and cannot be successfully denied. Mr. Campbell admits that they do; and, if we are not mistaken in our recollection, so does Dr. Carson. But these passages not only refer to baptism; they describe and define it. But do they speak of it as immersion?

No. Do they connect immersion with it as an essential part of it? No. The first says it is a *sanctification*, a *cleansing*, a *catharism* (*catharisios*), "with the *washing* [*loutro*] of water in or by the word." The other says it is "the *washing* [*loutron*] of regeneration." Who, but one bent upon the support of a sectarian system right or wrong, would ever think of finding immersion in these texts? It is not in them. We have already given the meaning of *louo* or *loutron*. (See Chapter V., on the case of Naaman.) Immersion is no part of its meaning. Galerius in his lexicon says it signifies "not only to wash or bathe, but also to moisten, foment, pour, or sprinkle." Basil applies it to denote the baptism of Ariantheus the prætor, who was converted on his death-bed, who was baptized by sprinkling. (See his Letter 386.) Julius Pollux, seq., 46, lib. 10, cap. 10, uses it to designate basins used for washing the hands and face. Zonaras defines *loutron* to mean "any thing which produces the removal of impurity." What, then, is a religious *loutron* but a religious *cleansing or purifying?*

Now, what higher authority as to the scriptural meaning of baptism is there upon this earth than these passages? They may be called God's own definition of the word and the sacrament of which it is the name. And, gathering up what they teach on the subject in dispute, we are shut up and compelled to say that the Christian, Biblical, and divine sense of *baptizo* is *a religious catharism, cleansing, washing, or purifying.*

Apart from its religious application, this mean-

ing was not first attached to this word by the writers of the New Testament. We have sufficiently set forth this fact in our preceding discussion. Dr. Carson admits that in confining *baptizo* to the exclusive modal sense of dip, he has "all the lexicographers and commentators against" him. Mr. George Wilson, who styles himself "an exiled minister of the Associate Reformed Church," and who has volunteered to furnish us with his lucubrations in support of immersion baptism, says, "That *baptizo* is frequently used where the design of the action was to *wash*, we have no reason to dispute." (P. 95.) We have shown that the word *bapto*, from which *baptizo* is derived, has the significations of *wash, cleanse, wet, moisten,* and *bedew.* We have shown that there is nothing in the addition of *zo* or *izo* to exclude or augment this sense. We have shown, by more than twenty lexicons, and as many authorities additional, that *wash, cleanse, purify* is one of the plain and common significations of this disputed word. We have demonstrated, from the Alexandrine or Hebraic Greek of the Septuagint and patristic writers, that *wash, cleanse,* and *purify,* especially in a religious sense, is one of the commonest and the almost exclusive sense in which the word is employed in that kind of Greek writing. It was therefore neither far-fetched nor violent, but natural, easy, and very much demanded by the nature of the case, for the Holy Ghost to take up and employ this word always in the same specific sense of a religious cleansing, washing, or purification.

But even if *baptizo* had never been used in this sense previous to its introduction into the New Testament, that it *is* so used by the Holy Ghost is a *fixed fact,* which no ingenuity or eloquence on earth can unsettle. We have seen that it is used by the inspired John as the synonym of *katharizo,* which means only to *cleanse,* especially in a religious, legal, or ceremonial sense. Paul employs it to denote the work of God's Spirit in the sinner's heart, which is a purification, and not an immersion. John is again and again called the *baptizer,* and was supposed to be either Elias or the Christ simply because he cleansed Israel by a religious purifying. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls all the various sprinklings, expiations, and lustrations under the Jewish law, many of which certainly were not immersions, *divers baptisms,* only because they were *purifications.* The Pharisaic washing of hands before eating, the washing of pots and cups and brazen vessels, and the sprinkling of beds and couches, are all called *baptisms,* upon no other ground than that they were ceremonial *purifications.* Christ himself is said to have been *baptized* (with water by John, and with blood and agony in Gethsemane and on the cross) for the expressed purpose, and only in this respect, that he might fulfill all righteousness, (Matt. iii. 15,) and be perfected through sufferings, (Heb. ii. 10,) and have effected in himself the great purgation through which those who are in him are justified and purified forever. The Israelites are said to have been *baptized* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, because, according to Vitringa, Wolf, Ben-

gel, Rosenmüller, Semler, Schleusner, and others, they were thereby initiated into the religion which Moses taught, ransomed from their degradation and bondage in Egypt, absolved from their old taskmasters, consecrated as God's peculiar people, *purified* from their former associations with the heathen, and, by a wonderful divine interposition, *separated* from the vile and blaspheming, as a people henceforth and forever specially ordained to hear God's messengers and to obey God's law. That baptism was not an immersion; the hosts of Pharaoh alone were immersed; but it was a mysterious consecration, an absolution, an induction into a new and holier state, a *purification.* Augustine (Serm. de Catach., vol. ix. p. 320, Paris, 1586) speaks of it as a "*salvation by water.*" "One element," says he, "by the command of the Creator, judged both; for it separated the righteous from the wicked. The former it *washed,* the latter it overwhelmed; the former it PURIFIED, the latter it destroyed." Hilary paraphrases the words thus:—"Their past sins were not imputed to them, but they were *purified* [*purificati*] BY the cloud and by the sea." In the same way, in Rom. vi. 3–11, Christians are said to be *baptized* into Jesus Christ, because in him their old body of sin is destroyed, their guilt absolved, their impurities purged out, and a glorious renovation effected. There can be no immersion in Christ, nor yet in the death of Christ; but there is *absolution* in Christ and his death, and *purification;* for his blood cleanseth from all sin. And there is not a single instance in the New Testament in which

baptizo is literally used, where it does not naturally, if not *necessarily*, take the sense of religious purification.

The testimony from the Fathers that *baptizo* has the sense of *katharizo*, and in Christian language means a religious purifying, is almost without limit, as Dr. Beecher has satisfactorily shown.

Take the lexicographers Zonaras and Phavorinus. They were not among the early Fathers, but they give us dictionaries founded on the early Fathers. Zonaras was one of the four leading Byzantine historians. He wrote annals from the beginning of the world down to A.D. 1118, and various commentaries on apostolic canons, decrees of councils, &c. Tittman says of his lexicon, "I consider it, after that of Hesychius, the most learned of all others that survive, the most copious and most accurate." And yet these great lexicographers say not one word about immersion in connection with baptism. They define "*baptisma*,—the remission of sins by water and the Spirit, the unspeakable forgiveness of sins, the loosing of the bond [of sin] granted by the love of God toward men, the voluntary arrangement of a new life toward God, the releasing or recovery of the soul to that which is better,—to holiness." All these are exact definitions of religious purifying. They are all meanings of *katharizo*. And surely those words must be synonymous to which the same definitions are given.

But these are not the mere opinions of Zonaras and Phavorinus. They are taken almost literally

from the Fathers. Basil, on Isaiah iv. 4, sets himself to give a formal and comprehensive definition of the whole import of *baptisma*. In this definition he gives three significations or applications of the word, in each of which the idea of purification is the uppermost. He says that baptism means purification from filth, spiritual purification, (*pneumatos anagennesis*,) and purgation or trial by the fire of the judgment. Clement calls the washing of Penelope and the wetting of the hands of Telemachus with sea-water, in Homer, and the lustrations of the Jews whilst reclining *on* (*epi*) their couches, *baptisms*, certainly not because they were immersions,—they were not immersions,—but because they were religious *purifyings*. Justin Martyr calls deliverance from evil passions a *baptism*. Origen calls martyrdom a *baptism*. Ambrose calls the sprinkling of the blood of the paschal lamb on the doors in Egypt a *baptism*. Cyril calls the sprinkling of the ashes of the burnt heifer on the unclean *baptism*. Tertullian calls the heathen ceremonies of sprinkling themselves, their temples, &c., *baptisms*. Athanasius calls the placing of John's hand upon the Savior's head a *baptism*. Gregory Nazianzen, in his thirty-ninth discourse, calls martyrdom, penance, and purgation in another life *baptisms*. Some of these same Fathers call the washing of the disciples' feet by Christ a *baptism*. How can all this be explained unless we take the word *baptism* in the sense of religious purification? Anastasius says he would not hesitate to call mourning a *baptism*. He says that "affliction, with humility and silence, is a *baptism*;" and the

reason he assigns is, that "it *purifies* a man." Tertullian calls the water and blood that issued from the side of Christ two *baptisms*,—of course not immersions, but *purifications* or *purifiers*. Maximus (vol. ii. p. 459, Paris, 1675) says that "sons of thunder" means sons of *baptism*. The explanation he gives is, that thunder is composed of water and air, an initiation into the mystery of purification. His philosophy is faulty and his language involved; but the passage is sufficient to show that he considered purification the proper sense of the word *baptism*. Chrysostom uses it interchangeably with *remission* and *reconciliation*, and Cyprian with the words *washing* and *cleansing;* all of which requires the sense of purification. Josephus, also, though not a Christian, speaks of John's baptism as a *purification*. (Ant. lib. xviii. cap. 5, sec. 2.) Chrysostom, in his thirty-third Homily, says that Christ "calls his cross and death a cup and *baptism:* a cup, because he readily drank it; *baptism, because by it he* PURIFIED *the world*." Theophylact, on Matt. xx. 22, 23, says that Jesus "calls his death a *baptism*, as making a *purification* or expiation [*kathartikon*] for all of us." So also, on Mark x. 38, 39, he says that Jesus "calls his cross *baptism*, as about to make a purification [*katharismon*] for sin." Gregory Nazianzen speaks of Christ's *baptism* in the Jordan as his *purification* [*kathairomenon*] in the Jordan. Several Fathers call the tears of penitence or prayer *baptism;* certainly not because suppliants were totally immersed in them, but because, as Nilus, the disciple of Chrysostom, says, they are "good wash-basins for the soul;" or, as Gregory of Nyssa

says, "fountains, by means of which you can wash off the spots and pollutions of your soul." In the passage from Origen relative to the baptism of the wood, altar, and hewn bullock in Elijah's sacrifice, the sense of *purify* is expressly assigned to *baptizo*. The passage is this:—"How came you [the Jews] to think that Elias, when he should come, would *baptize*, who did not himself *baptize* the wood upon the altar in the days of Ahab, *although it needed to be* PURIFIED, but commanded the priests to do it?" Baptism and purification are here used interchangeably with each other; and the author only means to affirm that the baptizing or purifying of the wood on the altar was not performed by Elijah himself, but by the priests.

But this is still not all. The command in Isaiah i. 16 is a command to wash, make clean, and put away evil. Justin Martyr, Cyril, and Hippolytus call it a prophetic injunction of *baptism*. The promise in Ezekiel xxvi. 25 is a promise *to sprinkle* with clean water and to cleanse from filthiness and idols. Cyprian, Jerome, and others pronounce it a prediction concerning *baptism*. This application of the promise is of frequent occurrence in the writings of the Fathers. What modern Baptist would not feel that he had surrendered his creed and abandoned his denomination if he were to make the same application? The phrase in Isaiah liii. 15, "He shall *sprinkle* many nations," Jerome applies also to *baptism*. He thus states its meaning:—"He shall *sprinkle*, &c., cleansing them in his own blood, and *by baptism* consecrating them to the service of God." The prophecy in Isaiah iv. 4

relates to purification by washing, judgment, and the spirit of burning. Basil, Jerome, Origen, Eusebius, and Theodoret call it *baptism*, which is partly accomplished in the present life and partly in the life to come. The declaration in Psalm lxvi. 10 speaks only of the process by which metals are freed from dross. One writing in the name of Chrysostom calls it a *baptism;* "for," says he, "as gold or silver is *purified* in the furnace by consuming the dross, so a man placed in the furnace of affliction is *purified*." Malachi iii. 3 speaks only of purifying and purging. Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria speak of it as a prophecy of *baptism*, and comment upon it as explaining why the Jews demanded of John why he *baptized*, if he was neither Elias nor the Christ. And Athanasius says, explicitly, "The expression, He shall BAPTIZE you with the Holy Ghost, means this, *that he shall* PURIFY *you* [*kathariei humas*]." Indeed, Cyprian has this broad declaration,—that "as often as water alone is mentioned in the Sacred Scriptures, *baptism* is alluded to;" "because," says Isidore Hispalensis, "water is a *purifier*, and is the only element that purifies all things." Augustine, also, has this passage:—"When we say that Christ *baptizes*, we do not say that he holds and washes in water the body of the believer, but that he invisibly PURIFIES him, and not only him, but the whole Church."

From all this is not the conclusion inevitable that *baptizo*, as a religious term, does not mean "a total immersion and nothing else," nor yet to sprinkle or pour, but *to purify*, without limitation

as to mode? Even Maimonides, upon whom Dr. Fuller relies so much, applies the word *baptism* to a general religious purification. "There are three things," says he, "by which the Israelites entered into covenant with God,—circumcision, *baptism*, and sacrifice. *Baptism* was practiced in the desert before the giving of the law; FOR *God said to Moses*, SANCTIFY THEM." (*Issure Biah*, Perek 13.) Did Moses *immerse* the people? Certainly not. He only commanded them to purify themselves by taking care that no defilement was on them, by abstaining from all fleshly indulgences, and by washing their clothes, repenting of their sins, and lifting their hearts to God. And this general *purification* is cited as an instance and an evidence of Mosaic *baptism*. Indeed, so thoroughly were some of the translators of the Bible convinced that *to baptize* is *to purify*, that the Saxon Testament has John *le Fullvbtere*,—literally, *the Scourer;* and the Icelandic translates baptism *skira*,—literally, to *scour;* that is, to *cleanse*.

Indeed, all respectable versions of the New Testament, from its first publication until now, are against the Baptist interpretation of *baptizo*. The venerable Peshito-Syriac and the Philoxenian render it by *amad*,—the primary meaning of which, according to Schaaf's Syriac Lexicon, is *abluo*, to *wash* or *cleanse*. The Syriac word for immerse is *tzeva;* but it is never employed to translate *baptizo*. The Arabic uses a term of the same import as the Syriac *amad*. The Persic version gives for *baptizo* a word meaning *to wash*. The Ethiopic, the Sahidic, the Basmuric, the Arminian, the German,

the Swedish, the Danish, the English in all its old versions, the French, the Spanish, and, in one place, even the Campbellite-*Baptist* version, give *washing, cleansing, purifying,* or words to this effect, as the proper equivalent of *baptizo* in the New Testament. They could not do otherwise and remain faithful to the truth. And, indeed, as remarked by Dr. Beecher, the idea of *purification,* in the nature of things, is better adapted to be the name of this rite than immersion. It has a fitness and verisimilitude, in all its extensive variety of usage, which cause the mind to feel the self-evidencing power of truth, as producing harmony and agreement in the most minute as well as in the most important relations of the various parts of this subject to each other. First, the idea of purification is the fundamental idea in the whole subject. Second, it is an idea complete and definite in itself in every sense, and needs no adjunct to make it more so. Third, it is the soul and centre of a whole circle of delightful ideas and words. It throws out before the mind a flood of rich and glorious thoughts, and is adapted to operate upon the feelings like a perfect charm. To a sinner desiring salvation, what two ideas so delightful as forgiveness and purity? Both are condensed in this one word. It involves in itself a deliverance from the guilt of sin and from its pollution. It is a purification from sin in every sense. It is purification by the atonement and purification by the truth,—by water and by blood. And around these ideas cluster others likewise, of holiness, salvation, eternal joy, eternal life. No other word can pro-

duce such delight in the heart and send such a flood of light into all the relations of divine truth; for *purity*, in the broad Scripture sense, is the joy and salvation of man and the crowning glory of God.

Of *immersion* not one of these things is true. It is not a fundamental idea in any subject or system. By itself it does not convey any one fixed idea, but depends on its adjuncts and varies with them. *Immersion!* In what? clean water or filthy? in a dye-fluid, or in wine? Until these questions are answered the word is of no use. And with the spiritual sense the case is still worse; for common usage limits it in English, Latin, Greek, and, so far as we know, in all languages, by its adjuncts, of a kind denoting calamity or degradation, and never purity. It has intimate and firmly-established associations with such words as luxury, ease, indolence, sloth, cares, anxieties, troubles, distresses, sins, pollution, death. We familiarly speak of immersion and sinking in all these; but with their opposites the idea of immersion refuses alliance. Sinking and downward motion are naturally allied with ideas which, in a moral sense, are depressed and debased, and not with such as are elevated and pure. And for what reason should the God of order, purity, harmony, and taste select an idea for the name of his own beloved rite so alien from it, and reject one in every respect so desirable and so fit? Who does not feel that the name of so delightful an idea as *purification* must be the name of the rite? And who does not rejoice that there is proof so unanswerable that such is the

signification of the word which the Holy Ghost everywhere uses to denote this holy Christian sacrament? (See Beecher on Bapt. pp. 81, 82.)

May we not now say we have ascertained the meaning of *baptizo?* It signifies a religious *washing, cleansing, and purifying.* At any rate, Dr. Carson concedes that, "whatever may be supposed the meaning of the name of this rite, *it is in its* NATURE *a rite of* PURIFICATION." (P. 471.)

CHAPTER XIV.

SCRIPTURAL HINTS CONCERNING MODE.

After what has now been said, it is impossible for any man, open to receive the truth, not to be convinced that the New Testament and Christian use of *baptizo* is to signify a religious *purifying,* without regard to mode. That the sacred and Christian writers have used it in this sense, and that with reference to purifyings performed in every variety of mode, is settled,—may we not say *demonstrated?* It is not a matter of analogy or inference, but a matter of *fact,* which ten thousand proofs that *baptizo* among the old heathen Greeks originally meant to immerse, dip, sink, and drown cannot at all affect or set aside; a matter of *fact* so fully proven and so firmly established that a man might as well attempt to turn the course of the Mississippi across the Rocky Mountains, or

to overthrow the eternal hills, as to undertake to strike it from among the fixed verities of things.

Nor should it be thought strange or remarkable that a word which once so frequently meant to dip and plunge has thus passed over to signify a religious purification, without regard to the manner of its performance. Dr. Beecher has justly remarked that "no principle is more universally admitted by all sound philologists than that to establish the original and primitive meaning of a word is not at all decisive as regards its subsequent usages;" that "it is too plain to be denied, that words do often so far depart from their primitive meaning as entirely to leave out the original idea;" and that "such transitions are particularly common in words of the class of *baptizo*, denoting action by or with reference to a fluid." We will condense a few of his examples. *Tingo* certainly once meant only to immerse and dip; then to dye or color, as ordinarily performed by immersing the articles to be colored; then to color or stain, without reference to mode; and, lastly, it gave rise to the English words *tinge* and *tint*, in which there is not the least thought of immersion. The original idea of *wash* was simply to cleanse by a purifying fluid; afterward it came to signify the application of a superficial coloring, as to white-wash, yellow-wash, or to wash with silver or gold; and finally it has come into a use where the original idea of purity is entirely lost, as when we speak of the *washes* of a cow-yard or from the streets. *Let* once meant only to *hinder;* now it means only to *permit*. And similar transitions may be traced in the words

conversation, charity, prevent, &c. Carson says, "The word *saucer,* from signifying a small vessel for holding *sauce,* now signifies one for cooling tea;" and that "the foreigner who should allege that the English word *saucer* cannot signify a small vessel for tea, but must always denote one for *sauce,* would reason as correctly as those who attempt to force *bapto,* when signifying to dye, always to look back to its origin." (P. 49.) Exactly so; and the wonder is that he could not be made to see that the same law can apply to *baptizo.* Indeed, this doctrine of transition in the meaning of words is so clear and undeniable that terrible havoc would be made with modern writing to persist in interpreting every word according to its etymology. It is *use,* not derivation, that establishes the meaning of diction. Nor has anybody expressed this better than Dr. Carson himself. "Were the origin of *bapto* to be traced," says he, "even with the utmost certainty, to some other word or words of the language, its meaning in the language must be determined by its use in the language, and not by its origin. *Words often depart widely in their use from the meaning of their root. They may drop some idea that was at first essential,* or they may embrace ideas not originally applied." (P. 88.) Again: he says, "Nothing in the history of words is more common than to enlarge or diminish their signification. *Ideas not originally included are often affixed, while others* DROP IDEAS ORIGINALLY ASSERTED. In this way *bapto,* (the very word from which *baptizo* comes,) from signifying *mere mode,* came to be applied to a cer-

tain operation usually performed in that mode: from signifying to dip, it came to signify to dye by dipping, because this was the way in which things were usually dyed; and *afterwards, from dyeing by dipping, it came to denote dyeing* IN ANY MANNER. *A like process may be shown in the history of a thousand other words.*" (P. 44.)

Well, then, if this is a process so clear and furnishes so many illustrations, and if *bapto*, "from signifying *mere mode*," passed to the signification only of an *effect* produced "*in any manner*," why could not its derivative *baptizo* pass through a similar transition, from signifying immersion to the sense of cleansing by immersion, and from cleansing by immersion to the sense of cleansing "*in any manner*," to denote only the idea of purification? Reasoning from analogy or from the nature of the subject, there is nothing to prevent such a transition. On the other hand, Dr. Beecher has shown that circumstances existed prior to the time of Christ rendering such a transition exceedingly probable. And that *baptizo did* pass through some such transition, or from the beginning had associated with it a meaning so as to be employed by the inspired and the early Christian writers to denote simply a purification without limitation as to mode, is abundantly proven by the conclusive arguments presented in the preceding chapters.

This one fact, then, effectually and forever disposes of all Dr. Fuller's quotations from the old heathen Greeks to prove that *baptizo* in the New Testament "signifies a total immersion and nothing else." If it did originally mean to dip, it

had acquired the additional sense of *wash and cleanse* long before the Savior's time. Of this all the lexicographers are witnesses. The Septuagint, which was written more than two hundred and fifty years before Christ, uses it interchangeably with *louo,* which means to *wash,* without reference to mode. And so it is employed in the New Testament, in this one fixed and uniform sense of *purification,* without limitation as to manner. We challenge all the Baptist learning in the world to produce from the New Testament one single instance in which its signification is necessarily limited to immersion. In all their multiplied books, tracts, and arguments on this subject Baptists have never produced such an instance. They cannot produce such an instance. There is none such in existence.

With characteristic regard for fairness, it is the constant habit of Baptist writers to treat us and our position as if we held that *baptizo* means to *sprinkle* or *pour.* Dr. Fuller ascribes this to us as our doctrine again and again. WE DENY IT, and hurl back the statement as unmanly sophistry. We maintain no such thing. This would be limiting the word to mode, just like himself. We do not say that it never means to sprinkle. Schrevelius and Scapula translate it by *lavo,* which often has the sense of *sprinkling;* but our doctrine is that *baptizo,* in its New Testament and Christian sense, means *to purify, without limitation as to mode.* We do not read, In those days came John the *sprinkler,* or John the *pourer,* or John the DIPPER, but John the *purifier;* not I indeed *pour* you with water unto repentance, nor I indeed *dip you with water unto*

repentance, but I indeed *purify* you with water; not There standeth one among you who shall *sprinkle* you with the Holy Ghost, or DIP *you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,* but one who shall *purify* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire; not He that believeth and is *sprinkled* or *dipped* shall be saved, but He that believeth and is *purified* shall be saved; not Ye are *sprinkled* in Christ's death, or *dipped* in Christ's death, but *purified* in Christ's death; not that The fathers were *poured* unto Moses in the cloud, or *sprinkled* unto Moses in the cloud, much less *dipped* unto Moses in the cloud, but *purified* unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; not Go ye and make disciples of all nations, *pouring* them, or PLUNGING them, but *purifying* them, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Only let our position be fairly stated, and the Baptist theory will refute itself. Dr. Fuller sees this; and hence his equivocation and sophistry.

We proceed now to inquire how far Dr. Fuller's theory that the plunging of the subject into the element is requisite to valid baptism is sustained by those incidental expressions given by the Bible in connection with this point. We do not expect to prove that the Scriptures anywhere lay down any one specific mode for the performance of this baptismal purification, any more than to find inspired direction as to any one specific mode of receiving or administering the Lord's Supper. *The Scriptures nowhere prescribe specific modes for the observance of either of these two great Christian sacraments.* And we call upon Dr. Fuller and all his teachers to produce the passage which will confute

this statement. But still there are some incidental expressions bearing upon the subject of *mode*, to which we desire to direct attention.

Let us look for a moment at what is said about the baptism by the Holy Ghost, and of the mode of action by which this baptism is effected. John's testimony concerning Jesus was, "He shall *baptize* you *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* fire." Jesus himself promised his disciples, "I send the promise of my Father upon you: tarry ye in the city until ye be *endued with power from on high*." "Ye shall be *baptized with* the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 5.) Here was a sacred prophecy, the fulfillment of which has been recorded by the pen of inspiration. This baptism was to occur "not many days" after Christ's ascension. All agree that it took place on the day of Pentecost. There was, then, on the day of Pentecost *a great divine baptism*. How was it performed? The attempts of Baptists to answer this question have produced some rich specimens of Biblical interpretation,—"precious morsels," indeed. Dr. Carson says, "The disciples were immersed into the Holy Spirit: they were *literally covered with the appearance of wind and fire*,—completely covered with the emblems of the Spirit." (P. 107.) Just to think of the disciples *buried in the appearance of wind!* How sensible! How easy of comprehension! The "exiled minister of the Associate Reformed Church" tells us, from Ohio, that "they were *literally immersed in significant sound*"!! and that "the word *ekcheo* [*poured out*] is used to denote the *superabundance*, and *not to express the manner*"!

(Pp. 169, 170.) "But," says he, "we have no desire to undermine and destroy the meaning of *ekcheo.*" (P. 150.) Oh, no, not at all! He only desired to put it out of the way for this once,—until he had dipped the disciples "in significant sound"!! Pengilly, who with so much pretended meekness undertakes to give a full exhibit of "the various portions of Scripture relating to baptism," never alludes to this divine baptism of Pentecost. It seems to have been too tough a case for him to undertake. Dr. Fuller says that "there was a real immersion." (P. 85.) We ask, *in what?* He says, "Jesus compares the Spirit to *wind;*" and that "on that day 'suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty *wind,* and it filled all the house where they were sitting.'" The italicizing is his own; the impression which he seeks to make is plain. The disciples were *immersed in wind!* But how was it with the *"fire"?* John said that Christ would "baptize with fire;" and this was the literal fulfillment of it. Were the disciples immersed in the cloven tongues of flame? The Baptist world is silent. No answer has been attempted. There stirs not even "the appearance of wind"! But we turn to the inspired accounts of the transaction:—"And when the day of Pentecost was fully come, suddenly *there came a sound from heaven;* . . . and there APPEARED *unto them* cloven tongues, like as of fire, and *it sat upon each of them,* and they were filled with the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 1, 2.) Peter says of Cornelius and his friends, "The Holy Ghost FELL *on them, as* ON US AT THE BEGINNING." (Acts x. 44.) "God . . . gave them

the Holy Ghost, *even* AS *he did unto us.*" John says, "I saw the Spirit DESCENDING FROM HEAVEN like a dove, and it *abode* upon him." (John i. 32.) Peter says of the baptism of Pentecost, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, . . . I will POUR OUT my Spirit. . . . Jesus, having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, *hath* SHED FORTH this which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii. 16, 17, 33.) "Peter and John prayed for the people of Samaria, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for as yet he had FALLEN UPON none of them." (Acts viii. 15, 16.) "God ANOINTED Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost." (Acts x. 38.) "While Peter yet spake, the Holy Ghost FELL ON all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision were astonished, . . . because that on the Gentiles also was POURED OUT the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts x. 44, 45.) Paul speaks of "the Holy Ghost which he SHED *on us.*" (Tit. iii. 6.) Peter speaks of the first minister as having "preached the gospel, with the Holy Ghost SENT DOWN from heaven." (1 Peter i. 12.) And in Ephesians i. 13 we have the phrase "SEALED with the Holy Spirit."

Now, we are very gravely reminded that this *falling, descending, pouring out upon, shedding forth, falling upon, &c.* denotes one thing, but the results thereof another thing. We are told that it was not the pouring that constituted the baptism, but the consequence of the pouring. Very well: if our Baptist friends can gain any thing by the distinction, we have no great objection to it. But the pouring out or shedding forth unquestionably

gives THE MODE of that result. It gives *the action* of the case, and the *only* action of the case. We do not say that the pouring out was the baptism; but we do say that it was *the mode of it*, and that, so far as mode enters into this baptism, that mode was POURING OUT UPON. There it is. God's own Spirit says it. And God's own Spirit knows how it was done. Baptist critics tell us that the pouring was a *figure;* but of what? It was not a figure of the Spirit. It was not a figure of any quality of the Spirit. If a figure of any thing, it must be a figure of some action. It must figure *motion.* And that motion is the coming down of the baptizing element from above upon the subject. Make that element sound, or make it wind, or make it the appearance of wind, or make it fire and wind, it is all the same: this baptism was by *pouring upon, by shedding forth:* the *mode* was affusion.

But we deny that there was any "wind" in the case, or that there was any "appearance of wind." A "sound" there was; but we deny that the sound was the Spirit. It was only the indication of the Spirit's approach. The sensible form of the Holy Ghost, assumed on this occasion, was "cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." There was a shower of flame-like flakes alighting upon the heads of the favored ones, symbolizing the light, and purifying power, and heavenly inspirations that were being poured upon their waiting souls. And this was the baptism with the Holy Ghost. Whether the copiousness of the glorious gift was of a degree to deluge the subject or not, it was by descent upon him,—by

applying the element to him, and not by thrusting him into the element. Admit every thing that the invention of immersionists has devised to figure out immersion: the mode still remains the same, and refuses to yield. "The Holy Ghost FELL ON THEM." The Spirit was "POURED OUT." Indeed, the Baptist annotator Hackett calls it an "*effusion*," and says, "the fire-like appearance presented itself at first, as it were, in a single body, and then suddenly parted in this direction and that, so that a portion of it rested upon each of those present." (Acts ii. 3.) This wholly excludes all idea of immersion.

And again: if *baptizo* includes *mode*, and that mode is *immersion*, then the idea of immersion must fit and harmonize with all these scriptural allusions to mode in connection with the subject of baptism. That it does not thus fit, the following *experimentum crucis* will show:—"This is that which was spoken: . . . I will *immerse out* my Spirit upon all flesh." "I saw the Spirit *immersing* from heaven like a dove." "Jesus hath *immersed* forth this which ye now see and hear." "As yet the Holy Ghost had *immersed* upon none of them." "On the Gentiles also was *immersed* out the gift of the Holy Ghost." "The Holy Ghost, which he *immersed* on us." "The Holy Ghost *immersed* down from heaven!" How ridiculous and shocking would be such readings! And the whole ground of the difficulty thus exhibited lies in this: that the Scriptures contemplate the application of the baptismal element *to the subject*, and frame their language accordingly; but Dr. Fuller's theory

contemplates *the application of the subject to the element.* And the language which describes the one operation cannot possibly be construed with that which describes the other.

So far, then, as concerns the baptism of the Spirit, the doctrine that the subject must be plunged into the baptismal element in order to be baptized is not only without scriptural foundation, but in absolute contradiction to every word which the Spirit of God itself has employed to describe the mode of one of its own operations. The whole description implies and relates to *affusion.* There is not one single expression that will tolerate the idea of immersion.

And if the idea of *affusion* is thus divinely appropriated as descriptive of the baptism by the Holy Ghost, what is more natural than to infer that the same mode holds good and is agreeable to the divine mind with regard to the baptism by water? There is necessarily a close resemblance between them. In many passages the same expressions are applied to both. The record of water-baptism presents exactly the same construction as the record of the baptism by the Spirit. Indeed, one is the type of the other. And, in the absence of direct proof to the contrary, are we not bound to believe that the mode in one is correspondent with the mode in the other? When Peter saw the Holy Ghost *falling on* Cornelius and his friends, his mind instantly recurred to the baptism of John. "Then remembered I, . . . John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." What laws of

mental association could thus carry him back from the contemplation of the *affusion* of the Spirit to a water-baptism, unless that water-baptism was performed by a similar *affusion?*

We look next at the baptism of Christ spoken of in Luke xiii. 50, Mark x. 38, Matt. xx. 22, 23. This is uniformly understood by Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, Augustine, and all the Fathers, as a baptism of blood. But the Savior never was totally *immersed* in blood. In the garden he was only *bedewed* with drops oozing from his pores. On the cross he was merely stained with what trickled from his pierced hands, feet, and temples, and flowed from his wounded side. If we understand it of the wrath of God which he endured for sinners, that wrath is always spoken of as *poured out:* Ps. lxix. 24, lxxix. 6; Jer. x. 25; Ezek. vii. 8, xxi. 31; 2 Chron. xii. 7; Isa. xlii. 25; Jer. vii. 20; Lam. ii. 4; Ezek. xx. 33. If we understand it of the stripes and iniquities which he bore for the world's salvation, these things are everywhere spoken of as *laid on* him: Isa. liii. 4, 6, 8; 1 Pet. ii. 24. And it would be doing violence to the ordinary construction of language to read the Savior's words as if he had said, "Are ye able to be *immersed* WITH THE IMMERSION I am *immersed with?*" "I have an *immersion* to be *immersed* WITH." "Can ye be *immersed* WITH THE IMMERSION I am *immersed with?*" How much more natural and consistent to understand the question, "Can ye endure to have *laid* or *poured upon* you what I have *laid upon* me?" So that in regard to this baptism, as in regard to the baptism by the

Spirit, the entire phraseology of the Bible contemplates the application of the element to the subject in a way answering to *affusion*, and to *affusion alone*.

We look next at the relation of the ordinance of Christian baptism to the old economy, to see what light can be gathered as to the mode of its administration. Whatever Dr. Fuller may say to the contrary, the New Testament is the development of the Old Testament,—the flower of which that was the stem, the harvest of which that was the seed-time, the full-grown man of which that was the swaddling infant. All great and sound theologians, from Paul to the present moment, have uniformly so regarded it. Jesus, the great theme and substance of the New Testament, is the same of whom Moses in the law and the prophets did write. And there is not one marked particular in all the gospel that had not its dim beginning in the Old Testament. If we take *Faith*, Abraham was the very father of the faithful, and its most illustrious examples are found in the olden time: Rom. iv. 11, 16; Heb. xi. If we take the *Atonement*, the Lamb of God, which taketh away sin, was in the old sacrifices "slain from the foundation of the world:" Rev. xiii. 8; Luke xxiv. 25, 27. If we take the *Lord's Supper*, it was but an extrication of the ancient Passover from its typical connections with the old covenant, and its continuance under forms adapted to the transition which has long since been effected from prophecy to history: 1 Cor. v. 7. And so we are driven to infer that *Baptism* is also in some way developed

from germs which were planted in the ancient dispensation. Alexander Campbell says, "No person ever has understood—indeed, no person can fully understand—the Christian institution, without a thorough knowledge of the five books of Moses, as well as of the five historical books of the New Testament." (Debate with Rice, p. 161.)

As there was a Mosaic atonement and a Mosaic supper, so there were also Mosaic *baptisms*. Paul, in summing up the various services of the Levitical economy, says that they consisted of "meats, and drinks, AND DIVERS BAPTISMS." (Heb. ix. 10.) What these various baptisms were, and how they were performed, we have already shown. But Paul speaks particularly of some of them, and gives the mode of their administration. He tells us of baptisms by "*the blood* of bulls and of goats, and *the ashes of a heifer* SPRINKLING THE UNCLEAN," which "*sanctified to the purifying of the flesh.*" (Heb. ix. 13.) He tells us also of baptisms by "the *blood* of calves and of goats, *water* and *scarlet wool*, and *hyssop* SPRINKLED *upon both the book* AND ALL THE PEOPLE." (Heb. ix. 19.) And it is a fact that all the Old Testament ablutions, the mode of which was prescribed, without a single exception, were required to be performed by sprinkling. "There is not a washing of the Levitical law having respect to persons, nor an important washing of any kind, the mode of which, if there is any mode commanded, is not sprinkling." (Debate, p. 206.)

Now, these ancient baptisms, along with all the other particulars of the ceremonial law, the apostle

designates as "signs," "shadows," "*patterns*," "FIGURES *for the times then present.*" (Heb. ix. 9, 23, 24.) In these typical baptisms the *mode* is specifically given. That mode is the *sprinkling* of the baptismal element upon the subject. If the *patterns*, therefore, were true, (and, when we consider that God himself made them, we are bound to conclude that they were true,) it follows that, in the administration of that higher and holier baptism which these ancient services prefigured, *sprinkling* is an appropriate mode, bearing upon it the express sanction of God himself. Indeed, when the ancient prophet came to speak of the greater simplicity and power of the ordinances which Messiah should appoint, these Mosaic baptisms at once rose before his mind. The relation which they bore to what was to follow he distinctly foresaw. He notes the change which was to be made in the element,—from blood and water mingled with ashes to something more directly symbolic of spiritual purity; but no alteration in the manner or *mode* of its use. And in the name of Him who was to come he announced to the children of promise, "THEN WILL I SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER UPON YOU, *and ye shall be clean.*" (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) We have already remarked that the Fathers interpreted this, as well as Ps. li. 7, Isa. i. 16, iv. 4, Mal. iii. 3, as predictions concerning the ordinance of the Christian baptism.

Again, as remarked by Professor Wilson:—"In reading the New Testament, we are impressed with the perfect facility of administering baptism in all variety of circumstances. When residents

in Jerusalem believe, they are instantly baptized. When inhabitants of Samaria turn to the Lord, they are at once received into Christian fellowship by the same sacred rite. As the apostles go from house to house and travel from city to city, wherever there are converts, baptism is administered promptly and without any apparent inconvenience. To the universality of this statement, so far as we are aware, there exists no exception. Let the character and bearing of this general fact be candidly estimated. Will truth permit the assumption that the cities and houses within the range of apostolic labor were more copiously supplied with water than cities and houses among ourselves at the present day? If, then, the matter were put to the test of experiment, would not the administration of baptism by dipping, in numerous places and houses, be attended with difficulties almost insuperable? Would it not in many instances be impracticable to immerse a convert instantly and on the spot?" The author of this book knows of an instance in Western Maryland in which three converts to immersionism were required to wait four or five months before the region could furnish accommodations for them to be dipped. "Yet, in New Testament baptisms, the administration, in every variety of circumstance, wears the appearance of the most perfect ease and convenience. It must be remembered, too, that during this early age there were no houses of worship, no baptisteries, and, in a word, no ecclesiastical facilities for immersion." (Inf. Bapt. pp. 258, 259.)

And, in addition to all this, the very signification of the word *baptism*, and of the sacrament of which it is the name, lays the foundation for an inference that plunging is not a becoming mode for the administration of this rite. We have seen that it is uniformly employed by the Scriptures to denote *purification*. The whole meaning of the ordinance itself points to an inward *cleansing* wrought by the Holy Spirit of God. Immersion is not a symbol of purity. Its leading import is destruction. The sinking of a man always signifies degradation. The Hebrew word for immerse is expressly used in Job ix. 31 to denote the very opposite of purity. But the application of clean water to the subject is one of the liveliest images of purification that can be presented to the human mind. The Scriptures have again and again referred to it in this very connection. Sprinkling and pouring water upon one is an ever-recurring image of moral cleansing. What does God say in Ezekiel xxxvi. 25?—"*Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness and from all your idols will I cleanse you.*" We may say that the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a subject is God's own chosen image of spiritual purification.

With all these facts before us, how can it be possible for any unprejudiced man to doubt whether affusion is a proper and divinely authorized mode of administering the holy sacrament of Christian baptism? Who can look at them and in his heart believe that where there is no immersion there is no baptism, and that the great com-

pany of Christ's disciples are apostate from their Lord because they have not submitted to sectarian dictation as to the necessity of being plunged under the water?

CHAPTER XV.

BAPTIST ARGUMENTS CONCERNING MODE.

What has now been elicited from the Scriptures respecting the mode of baptism must of itself be conclusive in favor of affusion, unless the most positive and commanding reasons to the contrary are produced. Let us see, then, what Baptists have said upon this point:—

Dr. Fuller says, "My first argument is founded upon the force of the verb *baptizo*." But this is a mere begging of the question. The force of the word *baptizo* is the object of inquiry and the subject of dispute. And for Dr. Fuller to argue that the New Testament baptisms were immersions because the word means immerse, and then to conclude that the word means immerse because the baptisms respecting which it is used were immersions, is about as ridiculous a specimen of reasoning in a circle as could well be found. It speaks badly for a grave doctor of divinity, and still worse for the merits of his cause. We certainly have proven beyond confutation that the word *baptizo*, in Christian language, denotes a

religious purifying, without limitation as to mode; that it is applied to religious cleansings effected in every variety of manner; and that there are instances abundant in which it can by no possibility mean immersion. We have also proven that the intimations as to mode in the baptism by the Holy Ghost, in the bloody baptism of Christ, and in the typical baptisms of the law of Moses, all favor affusion, and for the most part exclude immersion altogether. And for Dr. Fuller to argue that the New Testament baptisms were immersions because the word means immerse, when the meaning of the word is the point of inquiry, is ridiculous and absurd.

"My second argument," says he, "is drawn *from the places chosen for baptism.*" That is to say, the places at which the baptisms of the New Testament were performed prove that they were immersions. Well, let us see how this is.

One of the most remarkable baptisms recorded in the Bible was the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. This was performed *in the city of Jerusalem.* Would Dr. Fuller have us believe that the city of Jerusalem was a *lake*, a *river*, "a great conflux of water," a general bathing-place for the nations of the earth? Jerusalem was a mountain-city, with no living stream or natural sheet of standing water sufficient to immerse a man within fifteen miles of its location. We even have Baptist authority for this. And yet *the places* at which the New Testament baptisms were performed are to prove to us that they were immersions!

But Dr. Fuller talks learnedly of *cisterns, pools,* and *reservoirs,* and gravely tells us that there were several such in the neighborhood of Jerusalem. He mentions *Bethesda.* But Wilde describes this as "an immense, deep, oblong excavation." Robinson says it is seventy-five feet deep. How could three thousand be immersed in such a place in one day? Mr. Ewing thinks it doubtful whether it was possible for more than one or two persons to descend into this pool at a time; and Mr. Carson himself concedes, "If my cause obliged me to prove that it admitted *two,* I grant that I could not prove it." What is said of it in John v. 1–4 can give us but little that is reliable, inasmuch as all critics consider that passage exceedingly obscured and doubtful by spurious and questionable readings. Bethesda was certainly *a receptacle for filth,* surrounded by porches where sheep were washed, and receiving all the drainage of blood and offal from the temple. Hammond, Michaelis, Kuinol, and others attribute its medicinal properties to the warm blood and animal deposits which came into it in various ways from the sacrifices. And when we consider that the persons baptized were *Jews,* purified to attend the Pentecostal festival, and subject to a penalty of seven days' defilement and exclusion if they should but touch any lifeless animal matter, it is simply preposterous to suppose for one moment that the three thousand, or any portion of them, were plunged in such a pit of filth in order to be purified into Jesus Christ.

Besides Bethesda there was but one other open

pool, so far as we know, *within the walls of Jerusalem,*—the fish-pool by the fish-market. This evidently was also a sort of *drain* for the water and filth which would constantly be accumulating where fish for the entire city were handled and sold. There is not one word of testimony that it ever was a bathing-place. Outside of the city, and supplied with a feeble, irregular stream from under the wall, was the pool of Siloam, described by Lynch as "*a deep, oblong pit.*" Its depth was at least nineteen feet. It was a place about as much adapted to immerse in as our ordinary cisterns and wells. As to the upper and lower pools of Gihon and the pool of Hezekiah, all of which were some distance from the city, it is the uniform testimony of travelers that they are ever dry except in seasons of rain. The celebrated pools of Solomon, which supplied water to the citizens of Jerusalem, were about twelve miles from the city.

The statement of D'Arvieux is worth considering in this connection. Of most of the houses in Jerusalem he says, "They are only one story raised above the ground-floor. Their roofs are of stone, and are formed into terraces: they contain cisterns to preserve the rain-water which is collected on the terraces,—an attention absolutely necessary in this city, which includes neither wells, fountains, nor streams." An officer who accompanied Sydney Smith during the war says, "At Jerusalem, rain had not fallen during nine months." And, what is very unfortunate for the Baptist theory, the account of the baptism of the three thousand says not a word

about cisterns, pools, reservoirs, baptisteries, or any thing of the sort: no, nor one word from which to infer that the awakened multitudes ever removed from the spot on which they received their convictions until after their baptism had been performed.

Our Baptist friends have fallen into a curious way of arguing in this connection. They insist that the only reason why John took "all the inhabitants of Jerusalem" out to the Jordan and to Enon was that he might have an adequate supply of water in which to immerse them. Now, if this was the reason why he took them to the river and to Enon, it must argue as strongly for the NON-immersion of the three thousand as for the immersion of John's converts. If he had to take his disciples out to Enon and the Jordan to find conveniences for immersing them, it proves that there were no such conveniences about Jerusalem. Either, then, they must give up the point which they claim,—that John selected Enon's many waters for the sake of facilities for immersion,—or they must admit that Jerusalem did not furnish such facilities. They may take which side of the dilemma they choose, and it makes sad inroads upon their theory that all baptisms are immersions.

Seeing, however, that his cause is so hopeless in connection with *the pools*, our author directs attention to the little brook *Kedron*, as furnishing "*abundant water*." But, unfortunately again, nine months in the year Kedron is *dry!* So says Voltaire. So says Kitto in his Natural History of

Palestine. When Spencer visited it it was dry. All the time Maundrell stayed at Jerusalem there was not a drop of water in it. So it was when Wilde saw it. So also when Stevens saw it. Indeed, Mr. Samson himself, a Baptist whose *wonderful* personal observations about Jerusalem are greatly relied on by the Lewisburg Professor and the editor of "The True Union," remarks that "the *brook Kedron,* as the original term indicates, *is nothing but the bed* through which the rains of winter drain off between the eastern wall of the city and Mount Olivet; and its channel is therefore *dry in early spring, several* WEEKS BEFORE THE PERIOD *in the month of June* WHEN THE FEAST OF PENTECOST OCCURRED." (Baptismal Tracts for the Times, p. 16.) Wells, in his Geography, or his editor, says, "This brook answered the purpose of a drain to the lands around the city of Jerusalem after rains, and possibly might answer the same purpose to some of the suburbs of the city and receive their underground discharges. Hence, perhaps, its name, *black.*" A gentleman English traveller says, "I cannot recollect to have seen any stream or pool near Jerusalem sufficient to allow the immersion of an adult person. The brook Kedron was so nearly dried up, that I do not believe a boy or girl could in any point of its channel, near Jerusalem, have found depth enough for immersion. I believe I saw no water between Jaffa and Jerusalem [thirty-eight miles] in which a man or woman could have been immersed." And Ewing remarks, "I cannot help mentioning that in no history, sacred or profane, have I read

of any persons *swimming* in or near the city of Jerusalem. Many calamitous deaths have at different times befallen its inhabitants: among all these, do we ever meet with an instance of *drowning* in that place or neighborhood? Herod the Great, indeed, who was reigning in Jerusalem at the time of our Savior's birth, caused his son Aristobulus to be drowned; but we are told that for that purpose he sent him to Jericho." (See Josephus, Antiq. liber i. cap. 22.) So that the resort to Kedron is even more desperate than to the pools.

Dr. Fuller sees that it will not answer for him to leave matters in such an unfavorable aspect. He must needs give them a better gloss, though he should have to resort to his old expedient of altering the sense of the record itself. On page 77 he solemnly declares that "*it is nowhere said* [*of the three thousand*] *that they were baptized in one day.*" Let the reader, then, take his Bible and examine the second chapter of Acts. A solemn scene is there spread before us. Peter, just filled with the Holy Ghost, stands forth as the preacher of Jesus to listening thousands. His hearers melt under his burning words and call out to know what they must do. "Peter said unto them, Repent and *be baptized*, every one of you." "THEN"—not in the course of a few days, as they could find places to immerse in, but "THEN" (*men oun*)—in the course of the transaction then present, in immediate continuance of what went before—"THEN *they that gladly received his word were baptized;* AND THE SAME DAY

there were added to them about three thousand souls." Of course, none were added to the disciples but those who gladly received Peter's word; and baptism was the divinely appointed method by means of which men were to be added to the list of Christ's acknowledged disciples. And yet they that gladly received his word were "THEN" *baptized*, "AND THE SAME DAY there were added to them about three thousand souls." If this does not mean that they were all baptized in one day, it is useless to rely upon language as a means of communication.

So far, then, from proving that the baptism of the three thousand was performed by immersion, the place and circumstances lead us inevitably to conclude that it was done in some much more convenient and summary manner. The whole occurrence was sudden, unexpected, and without previous forethought or preparation for the exigencies which must have arisen upon the supposition that the subjects were all to be immersed. There was no water in or about Jerusalem for the immediate immersion of such multitudes. There were but eleven or twelve present who had received the ministerial commission to baptize and that were competent administrators of this sacrament. It must have been late in the day when the baptizing commenced. Peter began his discourse about nine o'clock, (Acts ii. 15.) It was of long continuance, consisting of "*many* other words" more than are on record, (ii. 40;) and the confusion incident upon conducting such a multitude to a place fit for immersion must have con-

sumed much time and greatly hindered the speedy execution of the work. So that, though Dr. Fuller may make himself merry over Dr. Kurtz's arithmetical process, he must remember that "figures do not lie," and that it is *mathematically* demonstrable that no twelve men under heaven could have immersed three thousand in the limited time and amid the embarrassing circumstances in which that baptism certainly was performed. And, if the thing was so plain and easy as he pretends, if he is not himself overcome by the numerous impossibilities which hamper and cripple the immersion theory, we ask him why he is so anxious to make it appear, even at the expense of perverting the record, that the three thousand were not baptized in one day. Why take to a resort so extreme, unless conscious that his cause is lost without it?

Yet Dr. Fuller would have his readers believe "there would have been no sort of difficulty in baptizing [*immersing*] more than three thousand in a part of a day." And he quotes what he calls "*facts*" as "the shortest argument to prove it." He says that Chrysostom "did immerse *about* three thousand on the 16th of April, 404, though twice interrupted"! that Bishop Remigus "immersed Clovis and three thousand of his subjects, aided by his presbyters,"—but whether in one day or not is not stated; that he himself has immersed "between one and two hundred" in "a very short time." So Booth says, "Mr. John Fox informs us that Austin the monk baptized and christened *ten thousand* Saxons, or Angles, in the west river, be-

side York, on a Christmas day!" that "a single clergyman baptized in one day above *five thousand* Mexicans, and did not desist till he was so exhausted by fatigue that he was unable to lift up his hands"! and that Francis Xavier "baptized *fifteen thousand* in one day"! Alas that the race of giants is extinct! Such instances of endurance are not heard of nowadays. The author of "Scripture Directory for Baptism" says, "A gentleman of veracity told the writer that he was once present when *forty-seven* men were dipped in one day in the usual way. The first operator began and went through the ceremony until he had dipped *twenty-five persons*, when he was so fatigued that he was compelled to give it up to the other, who, with great apparent difficulty, dipped the other *twenty-two*. BOTH APPEARED COMPLETELY EXHAUSTED." And, if the dipping of twenty was hard work for one day for one man, how could a man go through with *two hundred and seventy*, which would have been about the proportion falling to each apostle on the day of Pentecost? Supposing that water and all the conveniences for immersion were at hand, could the dipping of so many have been performed by one man in so short a time? Well has Dr. Miller said, "To imagine this would be among the most improbable, not to say extravagant, imaginations that could be formed on such a subject." The stories to which our Baptist friends refer on this point, taken as they give them, are simply ridiculous and incredible. Professor Wilson justly says, "The man who receives them will require no preparation for swal-

lowing the absurd miracles performed by all the saints in the Romish calendar." He has been turned aside unto fables, given over to believe a lie.

Look next at the case of the jailer and his family, (Acts xvi.) They were baptized in a prison at Philippi. Dr. Fuller tells us that Philippi was a place of *springs*. Perhaps he may yet discover that it was a place of reservoirs and pools! But the question is, were these "confluxes of water" *in the jail*, where the baptism occurred, and was the jail such a place as to beget the belief that said baptism was performed by immersion? He gives it as his opinion, notwithstanding the *springs*, that Paul took the jailer and his family out at midnight to some *river!* He seems to forget Paul's exhaustion from stripes, chains, fasting, vigils, and prayers, and that Paul peremptorily refused to leave the prison until he was publicly taken out by the authorities that thrust him in, (v. 37,) and that the account says the baptism took place during the exciting scenes of the night,—*parachrema*, ON THE SPOT. "Indeed," says Dr. Clarke, "all the circumstances of the case, the dead of the night, the general agitation, the necessity of despatch, and the words of the text, *all disprove that there was any immersion.*"

"I by no means think it incredible," says Ewing, "that there should have been a bath in the jailer's house at Philippi; but there is not a hint in all the Bible about the use of a bath for the purpose of baptizing, more than about the use of a basin. Water was brought (I know not in what vessel) to

wash their stripes, and water was brought to baptize the family. Every house-baptism supposes water to be brought and the baptized to receive the affusion on his face from the hand of the baptizer. The argument that 'there was a bath in the jail at Philippi, because there is a very fine tank in the jail at Calcutta, and always is one to be found in an Eastern jail,' may be illustrated in this manner:—There was a stove in the jail at Philippi, because there is a very fine one in the jail at St. Petersburg, and always is one to be found in a Northern jail." (P. 172.)

Look at the baptism of Saul of Tarsus. This was performed *in the sick-chamber:* at least, so the Evangelist leaves us to infer. For three days this smitten persecutor lay, a blind, exhausted, and helpless invalid, upon his bed. By direction of God, Ananias came to him and stated to him his mission, and touched him, and he arose from his couch and was baptized, and meat was given him, and he was strengthened: Acts xix. 1–19. What room is here to infer immersion?

Our Baptist friends have shown some fine powers of imagination in connection with this case to fill out what the Holy Ghost has lacked, in making things harmonize with the immersion theory. The good Father Taylor breaks out, very poetically, "See what a heavenly hurry Saul was in, though weakened down by a distressing fast. Behold him, with great weakness of body and load of his guilt, *staggering along to the water!* I almost fancy that I see the dear little man (he was afterward called Paul, which signifies little) *hanging on the shoulders*

of Ananias, and hurrying him up, with his right arm around him, [*!!*] and, *as they walked on,* saying, Be of good cheer, brother Saul; when you are baptized, your sins, or the guilt of them, shall be washed away."!!! Alexander Campbell also speaks of Paul and Ananias "*on their way to the water,*" and of Paul "*on his return from the water.*" (Debate with Rice, p. 228.) But the mischief to all their poetry is that the Bible says not one word about all this. There is nothing of going down to the water or of coming up from the water. Nor are such expressions ever used when baptism is said to have occurred within-doors. "It is also observable," says Ewing, "that, after a fast of three days, Paul was baptized before he had received either meat or strength: (verses 18, 19.)" He "arose and was baptized" on the spot; and all beyond this is like Father Xavier's immersion of fifteen thousand in one day—all fiction.

Look at the case of the eunuch. He was baptized on his journey through the *desert.* Is a desert a place of "confluxes of water"? Does *the place* here argue immersion? The water at which it was done is described, by Eusebius, Jerome, Reland, and even Mr. Samson, as a fountain boiling up at the foot of a hill and absorbed again by the soil from which it springs. How absurd to talk of immersion as argued from such a locality! Mr. Samson, from personal observation of the place, finds it impossible to get through with the immersion theory without supposing some artificial reservoir or other fixture. (Baptismal Tracts, p. 160.) What a mania for cistern-digging must have

possessed these Jews, that they should fill even the desert with pools!

Cornelius and his friends were most likely baptized in his own house. The language of Peter—"Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?"—indicates with a good degree of certainty that no more water was used than could be conveniently conveyed to him. How can this argue immersion? All room for fancy to figure out a walk to the river is here cut off. The water *was brought to the candidates*, not the subjects led out to the water. And, as the bringing of the water proves narrow limitations as to quantity, it excludes all idea of immersion. Indeed, Mr. Munro has hit exactly upon the truth where he says, "Among the myriads of baptisms of which we read in the Acts of the Apostles, with the single exception of that of the eunuch, there is not a hint about going to or from any pool or river." The *places*, then, cannot prove immersion as the mode of baptism.

But *John's baptism!* Ay, *John's baptism!* But John's baptism was not Christian baptism. All theologians agree to this. Baptists themselves have been forced to concede it. Robert Hall was a Baptist, a scholar, and a full-hearted man of God. He gives a long and unanswerable argument, showing that John's baptism was a wholly different thing from the ordinance instituted by Jesus Christ. (See his Works, vol. i. p. 294.) The distinguished Dr. J. H. Kurtz, of Dorpat, in his Manual of Sacred History, says, "The baptism of John does not possess the rank and character of

Christian baptism. The former was merely a symbol; the latter is a sacrament: the former was, according to the declaration of John himself, a baptism with water unto repentance; the latter is a baptism with water *and* the Holy Ghost, whereby the great salvation is fully appropriated; and, in the case of the disciples of Jesus, it was a baptism with fire and the Holy Ghost." (P. 278.) Mr. Carson says the two were "*essentially different.*" Nevertheless, Dr. Fuller argues that John baptized *in* (*at*) *Jordan;* that he must therefore have immersed the people in the water; and that therefore all other baptisms were immersions and nothing else! As well might he argue that, as "John baptized in the wilderness," he immersed the people in the sand, and that therefore all baptisms are immersions in the sand! John also baptized "*in Bethabara, beyond Jordan.*" This is the name of a *town.* Where it was located is not precisely known. Lightfoot says "it was situated in the Scythopolitan country, where the Jews dwelt among the Syrophenicians." It certainly was neither a lake, nor a pool, nor a river; and how can it prove that John immersed? John also baptized "*in* or *at Enon, near to Salim.*" *Enon* means the fountains of *On.* And if deep water, convenient for immersion, was the object of the baptizer in selecting this spot for his operations, why did he leave *the river* for a few *springs?* Dr. Fuller thinks it very ridiculous to suppose that mills driven by water are built upon firm streams merely to supply drink for the people who may visit them with their horses and mules! But, when

we see these same establishments performing their offices with equal facility where there are no firm streams, is it not equally ridiculous to insist that they are water-mills at all?

But we are told "John was baptizing in or *at* Enon, because there were (*hudata polla*) *many waters* there." It is indeed not a little amusing to see how Baptist writers comment upon this phrase. Dr. Fuller wishes to make it appear that *hudata polla* means "a great conflux of water." He quotes a number of passages, such as, "His voice was as the sound of *many waters;*" "I heard a voice from heaven, as the voice of *many waters;*" "The Lord is mightier than the noise of *many waters, yea, than the waves of the sea;*" "The noise of their wings was as the noise of *many waters, as the voice of the Almighty.*" Dr. Ryland says that the phrase indicates a body of water the sound of which resembles mighty thunderings, the sound of a cataract, or the roaring of the sea, and that it is a Hebraism corresponding with *mim rabim*, which signifies many waters, such as the waves of the sea. What an array! If we were to listen to these Baptist commentators, Niagara itself is but "a tinkling rill" compared with these fountains of On between Salim and the Jordan! Well may we exclaim, "Happy *Enon!* ennobled by such mighty associations, by such magnificent alliances!" But, after all, the question narrows itself down to one of simple geography. Was there ever a collection of springs, or any body of water, in any district of the land of Judea, in any locality accessible to John the Baptist, by which these allusions to mighty

thunders, cataracts, and seas can in the remotest degree be justified? Such a cluster of springs would have been the wonder of Judea and of the world. The memory of such waters could not have perished. The traces of them would still be seen, and some faint echoes of their thunders would certainly have reached our times. And yet Dr. Fuller says, "*I grieve to find several writers venturing to assert that the location of Enon is known!*" (P. 65.) Alas that such a wonder in nature should have thus perished without leaving a trace behind it! European and American travelers have explored the Jordan from Tiberias to the Dead Sea; but none of them have ever seen any thing of this wonderful discharge of waters. In a whole day's journey down the Jordan, from the region of Scythopolis, (eight miles south of which Enon is said to have been located,) Lieutenant Lynch found no streams emptying into the Jordan except such as scarcely rose in consequence above mere trickling rivulets. In the time of Napoleon the French had a *corps of horse* at Scythopolis, and roamed the country down the Jordan, particularly exploring it on the west; but nothing did they find answering to the Baptist *Enon*. All that history has preserved respecting this wonderful fountain is what Jerome repeats from Eusebius, that it was eight miles from Scythopolis, south, between Salim and the Jordan. Calmet knows nothing about it. And from the time of Israel's exodus to the present hour such a thundering fountain as Drs. Fuller and Ryland speak of has remained unknown to our ablest geographers, to our most adventurous and ob-

servant travelers, and to our most inquisitive men. It is enough to say, there never was such an Enon. Sandys, according to Hamilton, says that "*Enon* are little SPRINGS gushing out, whose waters are soon absorbed by the sands." And, until some Baptist writer produces some accurate geographical description of the fountains of On, to persist in comparing Enon with the Euphrates, the Tigris, Niagara, and *mighty thunderings* is indeed "sinning by excess."

But does not John say "there was *much water* there"? So the English Bible reads. In the original, however, the phrase is *hudata polla,* which Beza and Professor Stuart render "*many streams* or *rivulets.*" Dr. Fuller says that "*hudor*" never means "*streams.*" But Donnegan says it is from the word *huo,—to wet, to asperse, to rain,*—and that it often signifies only *the drops of falling rain!* Demosthenes against Callicles uses it in this sense. And if Dr. Fuller will take the Septuagint and turn to 2 Kings ii. 19, he will find "*hudata*" applied to waters which Maundrell describes in these words:—"They are at present received in a basin about nine or ten paces long and five or six broad, and, thence issuing out in good plenty, *divide themselves into several* SMALL STREAMS, dispersing their refreshment to all *the field* and rendering it exceedingly fruitful." (Taylor's Facts and Evidences, p. 176.) And if he will refer to 2 Chron. xxxii. 4, he will find the same phrase applied to a number of *small fountains.* The record reads thus:—"So there was gathered much people together, who *stopped all the fountains* and the brook that ran

through the midst of the land, saying, Why should the King of Assyria come and find [*polla hudata*] *many waters*"—SUPPLIES TO SATISFY THE WANTS OF HIS ARMY? We would therefore be fully authorized to adopt the reading, "John was baptizing at the fountains of On, because there were *many streams* there;" that is, not many streams to immerse in, but many streamlets of fountain-water, better suited than the Jordan to meet the wants of the vast multitudes who came to hear the prophet's preaching.

Professor Stuart says, "A single brook of very small capacity, but a living stream, might, with scooping out a small place in the sand, answer most abundantly all the purposes of baptism by immersion, and answer them just as well as *many waters* could. But, on the other hand, a single brook would not suffice for the accommodation of the great multitudes who flocked to John. The sacred writer tells us that 'there went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region of Jordan,' and they were baptized by him. Of course there must have been a great multitude of people. Nothing could be more natural than for John to choose a place that was watered by many streams, where all could be accommodated." (Mode of Baptism, p. 38.)

But Dr. Ryland tells us that *hudata polla* is a Hebraism equivalent to *mim rabim*, and challenges the production of proof that *mim rabim* is ever used as synonymous with small streams. But what is his challenge worth? In Numbers xxiv. 7, this phrase is used to denote water "*poured out*

of buckets. In Ezekiel xix. 10, it is used to denote *the small streams which water vineyards.* What thundering confluxes of water these must have been!

As there is no testimony, therefore, that the waters at Enon were at all adapted to immersion, the great drift of proof going to show that it was a place of *rivulets of spring-water* and not of thundering cataracts, we demand of the Baptists to give a reason why John left *the river,* where alone facilities for immersion were found? Does not the fact of such a change, from the great river to mere fountain-streamlets, prove that John's baptisms were not by immersion?

It is useless, however, to pursue this point any further. John's baptism was, at any rate, not our Christian sacrament; and there is no proof under heaven that Enon was any thing more than *a few springs,* or that the "many waters there" were any thing more than *small streams* issuing from contiguous sources. Indeed, if the Evangelist's mind had been directed to the waters of Enon by the idea of immersion, it is reasonable to suppose that he would rather have spoken of the depth and magnitude of *one* stream than thus have called off the attention to *many.*

How John performed his baptisms cannot be decided with positive certainty; but there are a few facts bearing upon the subject, which, if assigned their proper weight, present a strong and commanding presumption that it was not by immersion.

1. Although he for the most part performed his

ceremony of purification where there was plenty of water, *there is no proof that he ever went into the water to do it.* The truth of this remark is so clear that the great Baptist champion, Mr. Carson, is compelled to concede it. "I think," says he, "*there is no reason to believe* that John the Baptist usually went into the water in baptizing." And, in order to make out immersion, he is driven to an invention of fancy which thinking people must regard as a surrender of the cause. "The accounts lead me to conclude," says he, "that *John chose some place* ON THE EDGE *of the Jordan, that admitted the immersion of the person baptized while the baptizer remained on the margin,*" and that hence "there is no ground for the jest that John the Baptist was an amphibious animal." But in trying to avoid Scylla he has struck upon Charybdis. Who ever heard of a Baptist preacher administering his immersions without going into the water with his subjects? How can one man immerse another in water the surface of which is beneath his feet? And, if John could not have endured the amphibious life of going into the water with each of his multitudinous candidates, common sense will teach every man that he could not possibly have held out in the sort of operation assigned to him by the boasted "perspicacity" of Mr. Carson. "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan" must needs denote a great many people. Mr. Thorn estimates the number at *two millions.* Mr. Godwin regards *three hundred thousand* as the probable number baptized,—an estimate in no way extravagant. Considering, then, that John's minis-

try lasted less than a year, we are forced to the conclusion that to have *immersed* them all would have been beyond the power of any man's endurance,—a physical impossibility.

2. In all that is said about John's baptizing, and of the multitudes of all classes who were baptized by him, there is not one even remote allusion to those preparations which immersion would have called for. Upon this point we prefer to express ourselves in the language of one who was himself for years a Baptist minister:—"Every one who has been accustomed to baptize by immersion must certainly know that it is necessary, with respect to decency and safety, to change the dresses and to have separate apartments for men and women. This is evidently necessary, whether we baptize in a river or in a baptistery. Now, it is certain that, although we read of many baptizings, there is not the least intimation given either of changing the dress or of any suitable accommodation for the different sexes. This is true with reference to all the baptisms recorded in the New Testament. When our Lord washed his disciples' feet, it is said he laid aside his garments. And Luke, speaking of those who stoned Stephen, says, They laid down their clothes at a young man's feet whose name was Saul. Now, if the Scriptures take notice of the putting off of garments for the purpose of washing feet and stoning a man, how comes it to pass that, as thousands, upon supposition they were baptized by immersion, must entirely have changed their garments, or have done worse, the Scriptures should not drop a single hint about it?"

(Edwards on Baptism, p. 193.) And "if the *act* of baptizing," says Mr. Ewing, "had consisted of immersing the subject in water, there would surely have been some allusion to the lowering of his body in that supine direction which is, I believe, commonly observed for the purpose of bringing it under the surface; some allusion also to that stooping attitude which is at the same time necessary on the part of the immerser," especially if he stood on the shore. "But there is nothing of this kind to be found in all the Scriptures, either in the accompanying phraseology or in the name of the ordinance itself." Mr. Carson himself admits, "I do not know a single reference of the kind."

Now, upon the supposition that John immersed in his baptisms, this silence of the Scriptures on these points is not a little surprising. Let the reader consider the case. "A native of Judea resorts to the ministry of John the baptizer, and, conscience-stricken by the preaching of that faithful man, is prompted to join the ranks of his disciples. When he left his home, he had no more thought of baptism than of undertaking a voyage round the world. It would be therefore preposterous to suppose that he had made any preparation for an observance which could not possibly have entered into his previous calculations. Curiosity may have drawn him to the forerunner of the Messiah; but, before returning, he feels it a solemn duty to be baptized in the name of Him that was to come. The description does not present the case of a solitary individual: like a general term, it embraces its tens of thousands. Now,

on the hypothesis of immersion, we take leave to ask, were such parties *dressed* or *undressed* in submitting to the ordinance? The question is a plain one, and should be met with a plain answer. It suggests the only practical alternative,—of baptism with their garments on, or baptism in a state of nudity; for no one will imagine that the audience of John came to his ministrations provided with the bathing-dresses of modern Baptists. Let our opponents bring to the rescue of their system from this matter-of-fact dilemma a spirit of manly candor and Christian moderation. Dogmatism will not serve the purpose. Arising out of simple practical details, the difficulty cannot be removed by supercilious theorizing or the lofty announcement of general principles and laws of philology. . . . From Lightfoot, on Matthew iii. 6, we learn that when proselyte baptism was administered to a female, the Rabbis who rehearsed to her the precepts of the law, while she remained in the water, retired as she immersed her head, leaving her in sole charge of attendants of her own sex. She was not, in fact, baptized by the ministers of the Jewish sanctuary; the hand of man was not permitted to press even her head beneath the water; and hence such proselytes were said to have baptized themselves. Can we reconcile with the feelings of delicacy which dictated this course of extreme reserve the supposition of men and women publicly, not to say promiscuously, submitting to baptism by immersion in the Jordan? Do we not instinctively recoil from the idea of connecting a practice so indecent with the purest

and most refined system of moral conduct ever promulgated to the world? If the difficulties of the case, as they will crowd on every reflective mind, are not insuperable, we ask, with all sincerity, how are they to be overcome? Was immersion the mode? Were the females dipped in their ordinary garments?—or how? . . . Dipping without divesting themselves of their garments would have been equally uncomfortable, dangerous, and improbable." (Wilson on Infant Baptism, pp. 259–261.)

3. The manner in which John, in Matt. iii. 11, speaks of his baptism in comparison with the Savior's baptism of the Spirit, is such as to discountenance the idea of immersion:—"I indeed baptize you WITH water: he shall baptize you WITH the Holy Ghost and WITH fire." He uses precisely the same phraseology with regard to his own baptism that he uses respecting the baptism by the Holy Ghost. We have already seen that the baptism by the Holy Ghost is uniformly spoken of as being done by the *pouring out, shedding forth,* and *falling* of the baptismal element upon the subject. The inference therefore is legitimate and strong that the mode of action was the same in John's baptism. The very word WITH shows that he applied the water to the subject, and not the subject to the water.

But Dr. Fuller very learnedly tells us that in the original of this passage the word translated *with* is *en,* and means *in,*—"*in* water," "*in* the Holy Ghost," "*in* fire." But such a criticism is simply ridiculous. All the lexicographers tell us

that *en*, with a substantive signifying the instrument or cause, always means *with* and nothing else. Even Mr. Carson, whose authority Dr. Fuller cannot feel himself very free to set aside, says, "*en* may be translated *with*. It signifies *with* in classic Greek, as well as in the Septuagint or New Testament. It is also as freely used with this verb (*baptizo*) in the heathen authors as in the Scriptures. To convince any one of this, it is necessary only to look over the examples which I have produced, both with respect to *bapto* and *baptizo*." (Carson on Bapt. pp. 122, 132.) In Numbers xx. 20 we read, "Edom came out against him [EN *ochlo kai* EN *cheire ischura*] WITH much people and WITH a strong hand." Judges xi. 34:—"And Jephtha's daughter came out to meet him [EN *tumpanois*] WITH timbrels." 1 Sam. xvii. 43:—"Am I a dog, that thou comest to me [EN *rabdo*] WITH staves?" Verse 45:—"Thou comest to me [EN *romphœia*, EN *dorati*, *kai* EN *aspidi*] WITH a sword, WITH a shield, and WITH a spear." So Dr. Campbell says, "I should not lay much stress on the preposition *en*, which, answering to the Hebrew *beth*, may denote *with* as well as *in*." (Dissert. vol. iv. p. 128.) And if Dr. Fuller's criticism is to stand, then we must read that the servant in Matthew traded *in* his talents, not *with* them; that Christ cast out devils *in* the finger of God, not *with* the finger of God; that Paul proposed to visit Corinth *in* a rod, not *with* a rod; that the Lord shall descend from heaven *in* the trump, not *with* the trump; and that the man-

child in the Apocalypse is to rule all nations *in* a rod of iron, not *with* a rod of iron!

And if we are asked why we render *en hudati* WITH *water*, and *en to Jordane* AT *the Jordan*, our answer is ready. In the first instance *en* is joined with a substantive signifying means or *cause*, in the other with one denoting *place*. We read, "My servant lieth *at* home sick," not *in* home; God set Jesus "*at* his own right hand in the heavenly places," not *in* his own right hand; Christ accomplished his decease "*at* Jerusalem," not *in* Jerusalem, for he "suffered *without* the gate;" John leaned on the Savior's breast "*at* supper," not *in* supper; Paul, in his voyage, "arrived *at* Samos and tarried *at* Trogyllium," certainly not *in* Trogyllium, for how could a vessel anchor *in a promontory?* Indeed, Matthiæ observes that *en* is used with names of places when *proximity alone* is implied.

But, if we even take Dr. Fuller's translation of *en*, and say that John baptized *in the Jordan*, we have the highest Baptist authority that it does not necessarily mean *in the water of Jordan's stream*. Dr. Carson says that an army may be said to fight *in* Troy, though never once entering inside the walls of Troy. He says that an ambuscade may be said to lie *in* the river (EN *potamo*) when merely occupying the depressed grounds between the water and the remote outer banks; that Ulysses, after his shipwreck, spent the night (EN *potamo*) IN *the river*, although he merely waited between the water and the acclivity which lined the valley through which the river passed. His

words are, "He might be *in the river*, yet not in *the water:* all within the banks is the river." (P. 339.) So in 1 Samuel xv. 5 we read that Saul, with an army of "two hundred thousand footmen, and ten thousand men of Judah, came and laid in wait EN TO CHEIMARRO,"—literally, "*in the brook.*" This army only occupied the valley through which the brook ran. Our English Bible says they "laid wait *in the valley.*" Yet to be in the vale of a stream or river is said to be *in the river*, though the water never once be entered or touched; and Dr. Carson says, no violence is done to the literal meaning of terms to speak of two hundred and ten thousand men encamped in the valley of a brook as being *in the brook.* Very well, then: if John performed his ministrations *in the valley of the Jordan*, anywhere between its extreme outer acclivities, though never once coming in contact with the stream of its waters, it fulfills all the literal and natural meaning of *en to Jordane, in the Jordan.* Take the preposition as AT or as IN, it cannot bring the Baptizer or his disciples inside of the water, much less under it. To this Dr. Carson is witness; and so facts determine. Maundrell, in describing this river, says, "After having descended the outermost bank, you go about *a furlong upon a level strand* before you come to the immediate bank of the river." *Upon this strand of the Jordan valley* meets the import of *en Jordane.* We are therefore fully authorized to say that John baptized WITH *water* AT *the Jordan*,—a phraseology which leaves no room for the inference that he immersed.

4. It is an indisputable fact that the early Chris-

tians have represented John as baptizing by *affusion.*

Aurelius Prudentius, who wrote A.D. 390, speaking of John's baptism, says, "*Perfundit fluvio,*" he *poured water on them in the river.*

Paulinus, Bishop of Nola, a few years later, says, "He [John] washes away the sins of believers *infusis lymphis,*" *by the pouring of water.*

Bernhard, speaking of the baptism of our Lord by John, says, "*Infundit aquam capiti creatoris* creatura," the creature *poured water on the head* of the creator.

And with these statements agree many ancient pictures. We now have before us a copy of a representation in Mosaic of the baptism of Christ, preserved in the church in Cosmedin, at Ravenna, which was erected in the year 401. It presents the Savior standing in the margin of the Jordan, partially in the water, and John on a rock, with a shell in his hand, *pouring* water on the Redeemer's head. We have before us another, from the church on the Via Ostiensis, at Rome. The picture itself is on a plate of brass, partly engraved and partly in relief. The door to which it is affixed bears date 1070; but the plate is much older than the door, and, from the inscriptions in Greek, is manifestly of *Greek* origin and agreed to be of very ancient workmanship. In this picture Christ is not even in the water, but standing near the stream, whilst John with a shell is *pouring* water on his head. Forming the centre-piece of the dome of a baptistery at Ravenna which was built and decorated in the year 454, we have an-

other representation of the baptism of Christ. As in the one first named, he is standing partially in the water, and John, from a rock above, is pouring out water on his head. Of the genuineness and antiquity of these pictures there can be no reasonable doubt. And if those who made them and assigned them their places (though believed ordinarily to have performed their own baptisms by immersion) entertained it as their fixed belief, at this early period, that John baptized *by affusion*, are we not justified in presuming that he really did baptize something after the mode which they have represented in his baptism of Christ?

But Dr. Fuller argues that this cannot be, because the record states that "Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway *out of* [*apo*] the water." How could he have come "*out* of the water" unless he had been *in it?* But, even if he had been *in it*, that does not prove that he was *under it*. The young man in Tobit was *in* the river, but not under the water. Dr. Fuller often goes *into* the water and comes *out of* it without being *under it*. This itself would be a sufficient answer to the objection, though we are not necessitated to rest upon it. Dr. Fuller certainly will not contend that *apo* ordinarily means *out of*, much less *from under*. His master of Tubbermore says, "The proper translation of *apo* is *from*, and not *out of*. *I deny that it ever signifies* OUT OF." (Carson on Bapt. pp. 126, 137.) Jesus, therefore, only went up *from* the water, not *out of* it. Nay, more: if *apo* NEVER means *out of*, the demonstration is irresistible that John's baptism was by *affusion*

and not by immersion; for if Jesus did not come *out of* the water he was not even *in it*, much less *under it*

Is it not utterly unwarrantable, then, for any man to assert that the baptisms of John were total immersions? And if John's baptisms *in the vicinity of the river* were not immersions, the Scriptures speak of no other baptisms where it would be less than insanity to pretend to argue immersion *from the places* at which they were performed

Professor Wilson has a paragraph upon this general point, which we are tempted to quote, and which we transfer to our pages with the more freedom because his able and lucid work on this controversy has not met as yet with a publisher in this country. "The argument for immersion founded on *the places*," says he, "has always appeared to us to be feebleness personified. Yet that Baptists do allege this consideration in their own favor is unquestionable. How stand the facts of Scripture history? Out of nine or ten localities specified in the New Testament as the scenes of the administration of baptism, only two —Enon and the Jordan—possess a liberal supply of water. This fact will be found to grow in importance the more it is pondered, especially in connection with the efforts of Baptist writers to turn it to the account of immersion. Had the Scripture instances uniformly associated the ordinance with 'much water,' or had this condition been realized in the majority of cases, their argument would have been plausible. But the divine record presents the reverse of all this. *Much* water is

the exception, *little* water the rule. The ordinance could indeed be administered in the river Jordan and at the *many streams* of Enon; but so simple was the rite that its performance appears to have been equally convenient in a private house, a prison, or a desert. If, then, the volume of the Jordan is requisite to pour vigor into the Baptist argument for immersion, how sapless and feeble must that argument become when its nutriment is drawn from the stinted supply of a prison or the thirsty soil of a wilderness! The very stress laid on the small minority of instances apparently favorable to immersion certifies for the strength of the opposing view, which claims for its basis the decided and overwhelming majority." (Infant Baptism, pp. 257, 258.)

CHAPTER XVI.

BAPTIST ARGUMENTS CONTINUED.

We come now to notice Dr. Fuller's third and fifth arguments. The fourth we are at a loss to comprehend. He says, "It is based upon *the act performed in baptizing.*" What act? His theory admits no act but immersion. And to assert that immersion is immersion, and that therefore baptism is immersion, is a method of argumentation so far above our capacity that we leave it with the quondam lawyer from whom it comes, to be admired by those of his friends who may be able to

sound its mysterious depths. It far transcends all our science. We take his third and fifth arguments together, because, though introduced with imposing pomp, they both turn upon the meaning of two little Greek prepositions, *eis* and *ek*, as contained in one single passage of Scripture. He tells us that *eis* means *into*, and *ek*, *out of;* that Philip and the eunuch "went down both (*eis*) *into* the water" and came up "(*ek*) *out of* the water;" that therefore the eunuch must have been immersed; and that therefore baptism must be immersion and nothing else.

Now, if we were even to admit his premises, his conclusion would not follow. We have often gone *into* the water, and as often come *out of* the water, without having been immersed. Indeed, the *eis* and the *ek* apply here as well to Philip as to the eunuch; and, if *eis* and *ek* are sufficient to prove that the eunuch went *under* the water, they must prove that Philip also went under the water,—which would be a little more than agreeable either to Dr. Fuller's theory or practice.

But this argument of our Baptist friends also takes as its basis that *eis* and *ek* mean directly and only *into* and *out of*. This we dispute. Scapula gives *ad* as the first meaning of *eis; ad* means *to, toward, at, close by*. Bretschneider also gives *ad* as the first meaning of *eis*, and Stuart agrees with him. Buttman gives its leading signification *to, unto*. Schrevelius gives its first meaning by *ad*. Homer constantly uses *es, eis, eiso* in the sense of *being at, arriving at, going to*. In telling the fate of the Greeks, he says they came (*eis*) to Troy, but

never came INTO it, having been slain BEFORE it. And if *eis* always means *into*, then we must read, "The men of Nineveh repented *into* the preaching of Jonas," not *at* the preaching; Jesus went through the cities and villages "journeying *in* Jerusalem," not *toward* Jerusalem; the healed demoniac of Gadara was sent *into* his friends, not *to* his friends; Mary went "*into* the grave to weep," not *unto* the grave; the women, at the apparition of angels, "bowed down their faces *into* the earth," not *to* the earth; Mary "fell down *into* Jesus' feet," not *at* his feet; Jesus came *into* the grave of Lazarus, not "*to* the grave;" Mary Magdalene came *into* the sepulchre, not "*unto* the sepulchre;" Paul's journey from Puteoli was *into* Rome, not "*toward* Rome;" Abraham staggered not *into* the promises of God, not "he staggered not *at* the promises of God;" "Let us go *into Jordan*, and take thence every man a beam, and let us make us a place there where we may dwell," not let us go *unto* Jordan. In the same way we would have to read in Isa. xxxvi. 2 that "the king sent Rabshakeh from Lachish *into* Jerusalem," although it was only to the fullers' field outside of the walls; and that Christ directed Peter to go *into the sea* to throw his hook, not *to* the sea. But why multiply examples? The Campbellite-*Baptist* version of the Bible, in various places, translates *eis—to*, not *into*. Dr. Carson says, "I am far from denying that *eis* sometimes signifies *unto*. . . . It applies when the thing in motion enters within the object to which it refers. There are instances, however, in which the motion *ends* AT *the object*." (P. 131.) And the Lewisburg Pro-

fessor, Mr. Curtis, says, "That it may mean *at* is not questioned, because *all the prepositions are thus indefinite.*" (P. 154.) It is utterly futile, therefore, for Baptists to attempt to argue immersion from this word.

But, though nothing can be made for immersionism out of *eis*, Dr. Fuller seems to think that *ek* settles the case. He says, "*Ek*, with a verb of motion, always signifies *out of*." Indeed! But we have learned ere this that this writer's imperious announcements in connection with this subject are neither wonderful for accuracy nor final in authority. Let us to the Book. In John xiii. 4 it is said of Jesus, "He riseth up *from supper*." Does this mean *out of* supper? In John xx. 1, Mary saw "the stone taken *from* the sepulchre." Does this mean *out of* the sepulchre? How can Dr. Fuller take *out of* a thing what never was in it? See Matt. xxvii. 30, and Mark xv. 46. In Luke xii. 36 the Savior speaks of returning *from* the wedding. Did he mean *out of* the wedding? The same *ek* is used in the Sphærics of Theodosius to signify the drawing of a line *from* a mathematical point, as "*from* the pole of a circle." Will common sense tolerate the idea of getting into or coming *out of* a mathematical point? The same word is used by Lycophron in the sentence where the artist is said to "form men *from* the extremity of the foot." Is there any such thing as forming men *out of* the extremity of the foot? We also read of messengers sent *ek*—"*from* the chief priests;" does it mean that they came *out of* the chief priests? In Acts xii. 7 it is said of the imprisoned Peter, "His chains fell off *from* his

hands." Did they fall *out of* his hands? Dr. Carson answers yes:—"The chain must have been fastened *somewhere* WITHIN THE PART OF THE BODY WHICH THE WORD HAND DESIGNATES"!!! The cause of the immersionists is hard run. Dr. Carson is caught in Peter's chain! Behold him rage! *Ek* must mean *out of*, even though it should make the shearing of sheep the cutting of their fleeces *out of them!* (Pp. 340, 342.) But it is useless. In all these instances *ek* is joined with verbs of motion, and yet it will receive only the sense of *apo*,—FROM. Where, then, is Dr. Fuller's assertion? And how can *ek*, in the account of the baptism of the eunuch, prove that *eis* there means any thing more than *unto*, or that Philip and the eunuch did not merely come *from* the water, and not *out of* it?

Add now but two facts, and the necessity for rendering *eis* and *ek unto* and *from* in this account, or, at least, of so interpreting them as to exclude the idea of immersion, will distinctly appear. *First*, the passage which Philip expounded, the exposition of which led the eunuch to ask to be baptized, contains a Messianic prophecy which Jerome and others understood of baptism, and which Philip doubtless so interpreted at the time. Else how could the eunuch have been made to understand any thing about baptism? And in that very prediction *mode* is indicated. "So shall he [the Messiah] SPRINKLE *many nations.*" And would it not be unreasonably violent to suppose that the preacher did contrary to the very text before him? But, *secondly*, if any reliance is to be placed in the accounts of Eusebius and Jerome, sustained

as they have been by modern researches and a general tradition that reaches back to the apostles' times, there was not water enough there to immerse the eunuch in. It was not a river or a pool, but a small spring in a desert region, the waters of which were swallowed up again by the very soil from which they proceeded. And to persist in arguing for immersion on the precarious ground of two indefinite little prepositions, where it is almost certain that no immersion could by any means have taken place, is to exalt the empire of zeal over reason, truth, and common sense. And, though Dr. Fuller may continue to denounce us as "hopeless victims of hydrophobia," is it not better to be *rationally hydrophobic* than *insanely aquatic?*

As Bloomfield is often quoted by our Baptist friends in favor of immersion, we here insert his note on the baptism of the eunuch. Speaking of Philip, he says, "He baptized him, no doubt, with the use of the proper form; but whether by immersion or by sprinkling is not clear. Doddridge maintains the former, but Lardner (ap. Newc.) the latter view, and, I conceive, more rightly. On both having descended into the water, *Philip seems to have taken up water with his hands* AND POURED IT COPIOUSLY ON THE EUNUCH'S HEAD."

And let it further be noted that this case of the baptism of the eunuch is the only instance in the whole New Testament, the only case out of the many thousands referred to in the Scriptures, in which *eis* and *ek* are used to express the approach or withdrawal of the candidate to or from the water of baptism. It stands alone among

myriads. And, though these are the strongest words ever used by the Holy Ghost in such connection, they fail to prove that the eunuch even so much as touched foot in the water when he was baptized; and much less that he was totally immersed. Some have thought that he was immersed; but there is nothing to prove it. We think the circumstances imply that he was not. He hardly would have stripped himself naked in the public road; nor is it probable that he would have undertaken to travel with his clothing dripping wet. It is not likely that Philip went contrary to the Scripture-text before him, or that he immersed him where the strong presumption is that there was not water enough to do it. And, having disposed of the case of the eunuch, we have forever disposed of *eis* and *ek*.

Dr. Fuller's next resort is to what he calls "allusions to baptism." Some of the passages quoted under this head we have already disposed of, and we deem it unimportant to dwell long on the rest. The first we notice is where Paul speaks of the Fathers as "all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." We deny that there was any immersion in this case. Indeed, if baptism is immersion, then the Egyptians were baptized and not the Israelites, and the sacred record stands contradicted. The children of Israel passed through the sea "*upon dry ground.*" They were neither dipped in the cloud nor plunged in the water. And if Paul had designed by this language to set forth the outward mode of administering Christian baptism, upon Dr. Fuller's theory, he certainly

selected the wrong parties for his examples; for the hosts of Pharaoh really were immersed, which is not true of the followers of Moses. They walked *on dry land.* They were not dipped, unless one can be dipped on dry land. If they were wet at all, it was by rain or spray, not by being dipped in the sea. Moreover, Christian baptism demands an administrator; but there was none in the case referred to. Christian baptism requires the element to be brought in contact with the subject; but the Israelites were not touched by wave or cloud. And, so far as baptism consists of *immersion,* we are forced to conclude that the passage of the Red Sea was no baptism. That passage was a figure of Christian baptism in its import,—in its moral, practical, and theological significance, and not in the mode of its performance. Augustine calls it *a salvation by water,* and for that reason it is called *a baptism.* It was a glorious deliverance of the ancient Israelites from the hands of their enemies, a solemn separation between them and their heathen associations, a mysterious consecration of God's own chosen to his exclusive service, a miraculous regeneration, in which a new and holy nation was born, an impressive seal of God's presence and covenant with his people. All these are things to be said of the holy sacrament of Christian baptism now; and it is in these respects, and in these alone, that the passage through the Red Sea is called a baptism. It no more proves that we must be immersed in order to be baptized than it proves that we must be sprinkled with mists of spray, such as doubtless

might have been seen falling into that wonderful pathway from the boisterous surges above. The Psalmist thus refers to the wonderful miracle:—"Thou leddest thy people like a flock by the hand of Moses and Aaron. . . . The waters saw thee, O God: the waters saw thee; they were *afraid:* the depths also were troubled: *the clouds poured out water.*" If there is any *mode* of baptism here, it is a sprinkling, or such a *pouring out* of water as falls in drops. The Israelites were *baptized*, but *not immersed;* the Egyptians were *immersed*, but *not baptized.* How is this, if baptism is immersion? But, says Mr. Carson, "Immersion does not necessarily imply wetting;" that, though the people were not wet, they were immersed; and that, though this immersion was "different" from Christian baptism, it was yet "similar" to it! The doctor seems to be still entangled in Peter's chain. He had hard work of it. (P. 120.)

Dr. Fuller's next reference is to 1 Peter iii. 20, 21, where the apostle speaks of "the ark . . . wherein few—that is, eight souls—were saved by water, the figure according to which *baptism* doth now save us." But where is the immersion in this case? Noah and those saved with him were not immersed. By that flood they were *purified* from the wicked, and *consecrated* as the new seed to repopulate the earth; but they rode above it, unharmed by the shoreless waves which overwhelmed and drowned all else of human kind. They alone of all men were *not* immersed; and to make that gracious exemption a figure of immersion *is figuring* at a premium! The likeness which Peter finds in

the ark in which Noah was saved we interpret of the spiritual significance of baptism, of the purification of the soul by God's Spirit, and its salvation from the judgments which shall overwhelm the wicked. But, as Dr. Fuller has introduced it as proof of mode, he is bound by the logical consequences of his own premises. And who does not see that, if the figure of which the apostle speaks refers to *mode*, the case of Noah absolutely excludes immersion and establishes *affusion* as the only legitimate way? The rains fell upon the ark from above, but the waves never overflowed it from below.

Dr. Fuller refers us next to Rom. vi. 3, 5, and Col. ii. 12. In these words we have a sublime description of the wonderful efficacy of the gospel upon the inner being of believers, and of a condition of things resulting from their oneness with Christ which amounts to an actual reproduction of his crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection in the experiences of their hearts. But, sublime and spiritual as these Scriptures are, the attempt has been made to harness them down as the mere dray-horses to drag out of the mire a hopeless sectarian cause. Dr. Fuller so robs them of their literal force and meaning as to present them as the offspring of a luxuriant poetic imagination employed upon remote resemblances of a point of external ceremony,—as the mere intellectual play of a fancy fond of tracing faint analogies and of amusing itself with alliterations.

According to our estimate of the type of Paul's mind and of the connection and import of these

passages, they are the words of a man of God laboring to express some of the profoundest mysteries of the transforming power of the Savior's grace. The baptism of which he speaks is neither the baptism of immersion or affusion, or of any other mode of performing an external rite, but the inner and miraculous *purification* of man's whole moral nature by incorporation with Jesus Christ. The crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection to which he alludes, so far from being mere images of immersion and emersion, are literal terms, denoting realities, and pointing not to a figurative but to an actual death of every believer to his sins and his real resurrection to newness of life. The cross here is not the cross of going under the water, but the inward crucifixion of the old man with the crucifixion of Christ. The parallel in the apostle's mind is not between the outward mode of external baptism and the death, burial, and resurrection of the Savior, but between these particulars of his passion and the inward spiritual experiences of those who truly are his. His object is to show, not that Christians ought to walk in newness of life because figuratively raised from a watery grave in an outward ceremony, but that justification by faith, so far from ministering to licentiousness, carries with it and effects in the soul an extinction of man's licentious and sinful being, and sets up in its place a new and holy creature; that it actually transfers to the believer's heart the whole history of the Savior's passion, and continues it there as a thing now transpiring in the hidden experiences of every true disciple.

Dr. Fuller's interpretation takes in about as much of the real sublimity of these passages as the stupid traveler at Rome took in of the grandeur of the Coliseum by examining a detached piece of mortar from its walls.

But if we were even to admit the Baptist interpretation, and agree that Paul is here tracing a comparison between the mode of baptism and the crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, then the apostle comes before us in the absurd position of attempting to run an analogy between things in no way analogous. There is no mode of baptism of which we have ever heard which takes in, even in remotest resemblance, the various facts of this part of the Savior's history. Take the most favorable particulars,—the burial and resurrection. What resemblance is there between water —the softest and most yielding of visible substances —and a solid rock, the very image of durability? What likeness between dipping a man in a fluid and depositing a dead body in a horizontal excavation in the breast of a declivity? What similarity between the wading of a living man into a stream or cistern and the bearing of a corpse to its final resting-place? What analogy between the hasty lifting up of a strangling subject from a plunge in the water and the triumphant resurrection of the reanimated Jesus in the strength of his own omnipotence? What similitude between the glorified body of the rising Savior and the drowned and dripping aspect of the Baptist subject coming up from his immersion? Could any thing be more unlike than Christ leaving his grave-

clothes in his sepulchre of rock and coming forth unaided in his incorruptible body, and a man lifted hastily from the water, the same clothing sticking sadly to him and he looking a great deal worse than before his immersion? Is it not amazing that any human mind could have imagined that such a "sorry sight" bore any resemblance to the majestic and glorious resurrection of our blessed Lord? (See Dr. Webster's Water-Baptism Explained, pp. 19, 32.) No wonder that Dr. Fuller himself is so embarrassed with these discrepancies as to admit for once that "THE MANNER IS NOTHING"! (P. 74.) Had he made this admission from the start, and kept himself to it, he would have relieved his book of much false criticism and unsound reasoning, and spared himself the "pain" of pronouncing sentence of excommunication upon millions of God's own accepted sons and daughters.

But, again: what the apostle in verses 3 and 4 calls baptism into Christ, and into his death and burial, in verse 5 he calls *planting in the likeness of Christ's death.* But what resemblance is there between immersion and Christ's death, or between immersion and planting in *the likeness* of Christ's death? Was he put to death by drowning? He was not thrust down in the water, but lifted up upon the cross. He did not die by being gently sunk into a yielding fluid, but by being violently nailed upon an unyielding stake. Neither is immersion in water a representation of the idea of *planting.* What similitude is there between the dripping, soiled, uncomfortable-looking man, lifted by another from the

troubled water, and the beautiful young plant, painted by the rays and freshened by the showers of heaven, rising imperceptibly and noiselessly by the power of an inward life and vigor? If burial into Christ's death by baptism, then, is the same as planting in the likeness of Christ's death,—as the setting of the scion of the new spiritual man by the crucifixion of the old,—is it not clear as language can make it that the idea of immersion is entirely excluded?

Once more: the burial spoken of in these passages is not a burial in *baptism*, but a burial *in Christ's death*. Will language tolerate the idea of immersion in the death of another? Was Christ's crucifixion a fluid? There is *purification* in Christ's death, and by that purification the old man with his vestment of vices is *buried with Christ*, never to be raised again. But immersion in Christ's death, and that in *the manner* or "*likeness*" of that death, —*i.e.* in a way resembling crucifixion,—is an association of incoherencies that may be comprehensible to a Carolina lawyer, but surely not to common sense.

Let us not be carried away, then, as too many have been, by the mere sound of a word. The burial of which the apostle speaks is not a mere figurative, but a literal and real, burial,—an actual extinction of the carnal mind, and an actual abstraction and concealment of it in the deep abyss of eternal sepulture. There is not one of all these allusions that sustains the Baptist theory; no just laws of exegesis will permit them to be thus tied down to the signification of mere mode. They

prove that baptism is a *sanctification,* but they do not prove that it is *immersion,* or that immersion has any thing to do with it.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE HISTORY OF BAPTISM.

We come now to notice our author's last argument. It is drawn from what he calls *the history of baptism.* The substance of it is to this effect: that from the time of John and Christ to the third century baptism was invariably administered by the total immersion of the candidate, and that the present mode of administering this ordinance is a superstitious contrivance of a degenerate and corrupt theology. Shades of our fathers! *is this history?* History is *fact;* but these assertions are not fact. By taking the exact reverse of them we will be much nearer to the truth. We deny that immersion was the common mode of baptism in the apostolic period of the Church. The most patient and laborious and impartial examination of every legitimate source of argument has left us without one particle of proof that the apostolic baptisms were immersions. We deny that John's baptisms were immersions. We deny that the three thousand at Pentecost were immersed. We deny that Paul, Cornelius, Lydia, or the Jailer were immersed. We deny that there is any satisfactory evidence

that even the eunuch was baptized by immersion. We deny that there is a particle of evidence that the apostles ordinarily, if ever, baptized by total immersion. For though the inspired writers speak of baptism, directly or indirectly, on almost every page of the New Testament, and under a great variety of aspects, they have not employed a single term, or stated a single fact, or used a single figure of speech, which evinces that they either preferred or practiced submersion in any case; but, on the other hand, they have used language and related occurrences which can by no possibility be reconciled with immersion. Indeed Coleman most positively asserts that "the rite of immersion is an unauthorized assumption, *in direct conflict with the teachings, the spirit, and the example of Christ and his apostles.*" (Ancient Christianity, p. 367.)

"I will state," says Dr. N. L. Rice, "an important fact, which cannot be disproved,—viz.: No one can find any account of the practice of immersion before *the third century;* and then we find *trine immersion,* accompanied with various superstitions and indecencies."

Dr. Fuller's "*History,*" then, stands contradicted in its most vital part. Its very life-blood is wanting. For if the inspired apostles baptized in any manner without totally immersing the candidate, no subsequent practice, however general or tenaciously contended for, can foist immersion upon us as an injunction of God or as a thing of binding obligation.

Dr. Fuller quotes about thirty authorities to

prove that immersion was generally practiced at an early period in the history of the Church. But we are free to admit, and, so far as we know, none of the writers on our side of this controversy have ever refused to admit, that baptizing by immersion was extensively prevalent during the third and the fourth centuries. Dr. Fuller's authorities go no further than this admission. Not one of them says that immersion was specifically appointed by the Lord, or that the Christians of the periods referred to ever regarded immersion as the *only* mode of baptism authorized by Christ and his apostles; *and* FOURTEEN *of these very authors, and in the very passages quoted, tell us expressly that* THERE WERE ALWAYS EXCEPTIONS TO THE GENERAL PRACTICE, *and that there never was a time when persons were not otherwise baptized than by immersion.* Not one of them speaks of immersion as essential to the validity of baptism, or says that those of the third and fourth centuries who ordinarily practiced immersion ever regarded it as indispensable to the integrity of this sacrament. And Dr. Pond (pp. 42–50) has proven, beyond the power of successful contradiction, that immersion was *never* considered as essential to baptism until the rise of Dr. Howell's *"Baptist Fathers"*—the Anabaptists of Germany—in the period immediately following the Reformation.

Coleman, who has made so many concessions to Baptists, has justly said that the administration of baptism by immersion *was the first departure* from the teaching and example of the apostles on this subject; that it is not in harmony with the

Christian dispensation to give such importance to merely an outward rite; and that it is altogether a Jewish rather than a Christian idea, and indicates an origin and a spirit foreign to that of the ordinances of Christ and the apostles. (Ancient Christianity Exemplified, p. 367.) Neither is it difficult to account for this early departure from apostolic practice. Christianity began in the warm regions of the East, and in the midst of a people whose climate, habits, costume, and mode of life were all adapted to bathing; and nothing could have been more natural than the use of the bath as a mode of religious purifying on occasions otherwise convenient. This certainly was sufficient to begin the practice of immersion in baptism. This practice, once introduced, soon acquired strength from one of the primitive heathen significations of the word *baptizo*, and from false interpretations of Rom. vi. 3, 4, and Col. ii. 12. In addition to this, as Dr. Fuller himself remarks, "even in the days of the apostles we find corruptions insinuating themselves; and very soon after the time of the apostles *all manner of innovations and abuses began to creep in.*" (P. 91.) Pre-eminent among these abuses was that superstition from which Papacy took its origin, *the undue reverence for external forms.* "In all ages, the spirit of will-worship, the universal concomitant of human nature, has busied itself in rendering more operose and cumbersome the simple rites of our holy faith. When Christ proposes to wash the feet, this spirit is sure to exclaim, 'Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head.'" And amid those

deep-rooted tendencies to formalism and superstition, what was there to avert from the Church a surrender of herself to what fanaticism and superstition would regard as the largest and most effectual mode of administering an ordinance in which so much was supposed to be involved both of emblematical import and of sanctifying power? (See Beecher on Baptism, sec. 23.)

But, amid the prevailing departure from apostolic example which characterized the Church in the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, the validity of baptism performed by affusion or sprinkling alone was never denied by the Church. It was admitted to be true baptism. It matters not whether the instances of baptism by affusion were many or few. One acknowledged instance is as much and as really an admission of the fact as ten. As remarked by Professor Wilson, the question between us and our opponents in the appeal to the Fathers is, Do these venerable witnesses testify or not that there can be *baptism* where there is no *immersion?* If we can produce from their writings *one* unexceptionable instance of a rite acknowledged to be baptism, though administered without immersion, judgment on the appeal must necessarily go in our favor. Let the Fathers, in a solitary case, call him on whom the symbolic water has been poured a baptized man, and they stand committed irrevocably and forever against the modern doctrine that "baptism is immersion and nothing else." Are there any evidences, then, that the Fathers baptized without immersion? There are.

Cyprian, who suffered martyrdom in A.D. 258, has left us a formal discussion upon the propriety of baptizing *by affusion*, in which he argues that *baptisms thus performed* ARE VALID, PERFECT, AND JUST AS ACCEPTABLE TO GOD AS ANY OTHER. (See his sixty-ninth epistle.)

St. Lawrence, the cotemporary of Cyprian, baptized Romanus, a soldier, *with a pitcher of water*, and one Lucillus, by *pouring water on his head.*

At a period still earlier, Novatian, a converted heathen philosopher, was baptized *by affusion.* The writer quoted by Eusebius, from whom we have the account of the transaction, does not hesitate to call it *baptism.* (Eccles. Hist. vi. 43.)

Constantine the Great was baptized *by affusion* in 337. Clodovius, King of the Franks, was baptized by affusion in 499. Argilufus, the King, and Theolinda, the Queen of the Longobards, were baptized by affusion in 591. Gennadius of Marseilles in 490 said that the baptized person is *either* sprinkled *or* immersed

Hilary on 1 Tim. iii. 12, 13, as quoted by Dr. Beecher, says, "*non desunt qui prope quotidie* baptizentur *ægri*,"—*there are not wanting, almost daily, sick persons who are to be baptized.* Sick persons were baptized without immersion. It was done mostly by affusion. Emperors were baptized in this way; and yet formal histories in the Greek tongue recorded it as *baptism.* Theodosius the Great was thus baptized by Ambrose in his last sickness. Basil says that people were often baptized when they could neither speak, stand, nor confess their sins, and that it was done without

immersing them. Gregory of Nyssa speaks of the baptism of the sick without immersion, and calls it *baptisma*. "Did the Greeks proclaim a falsehood in their own tongue? Did they declare before heaven and earth that a man was *immersed*, when every man, woman, and child knew that he was not? Yea, did they declare it when out of their own mouths they could be convicted of falsehood? for they themselves declare that he was not." Yet they assert that he was *baptized*. (See Beecher on Baptism, sec. 57.)

Tertullian, born 150, speaks of the "*aspersion of water*" in connection with penitence and baptism, so as to leave us to infer that baptizing by affusion was common in his day, and not otherwise esteemed than as a valid mode of administering this ordinance. (*De Penitent.* cap. 6.) In the catacomb of Pontianus, out of the gate Portese at Rome, an ancient baptistery, which antiquarians upon clear and decisive grounds have dated back to the year 107, teaches the same doctrine. It is older than any copy of the Gospels now in existence; but it speaks nothing of immersion. On the left is a niche, in the rocky side, where the administrator stood, fronting a basin formed by a slight excavation in the floor. On the farthest wall is a representation of the baptism of Christ, in which the water is being *poured* on his head. Such a picture, in such a place, could have been for no other purpose than to instruct the baptizers and their subjects that thus was the blessed Savior baptized, and that thus baptism was legitimately performed.

The primitive practice of administering baptism by affusion has thus been engraven upon the rocks forever. And Venema, Salmasius, Eusebius, Baronius, Bingham, Neander, Winer, Gieseler, Coleman, and all the best authorities tell us that in the case of sickness, or when water was not easily procured, or when the baptismal font was too small, or when other considerations of convenience or climate rendered immersion difficult or improper, the patristic Church always held affusion to be a valid mode of baptism, and regarded it as *profanity and sin* to rebaptize any who had received this ordinance in that manner. Cyprian says, "If any think that they have obtained nothing, but are still empty and void, in that they have *only been affused* with sanctifying water, they must not be deceived, and so, if they escape the ills of their sickness and recover, be rebaptized;" as that would be to "question the verity of faith and to deny baptism its proper majesty and sanctity." Would to God that our Baptist friends were as thoughtful and reverent toward God's appointment in this respect as Cyprian! It would do away with many a solemn farce and save unsuspecting people from profane sacrilege. It is true that it was held to be improper for such as first applied for baptism in the extremity of sickness afterward to be promoted to high official positions; but not because the ordinary mode of baptizing clinics was esteemed in any way imperfect, as the Baptists insinuate. We have the express testimony of Cyprian and others that "the sprinkling of water *has like force with* wash-

ing *and holds good,*" and that it neither abridges the ordinance itself nor curtails the spiritual benefits with which it is associated. The only reason why those baptized in sickness were debarred from official honors is that assigned by Rufinus, Bingham, and others,—that the postponement of baptism to such an hour argued a great want of spiritual sensibility and showed an absence of that voluntary, cheerful, and unconstrained surrender to Christ which ought to characterize high officers in the Church. This is fully set forth by the Council of Neocesarea, which said, "He that is baptized when he is sick ought not to be made a priest (for his coming to the faith is not voluntary, but constrained) unless his diligence and faith do prove commendable."

It is, therefore, a fact that the Fathers of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries, though very much given to administer baptism by immersion, really did in many instances, and continually, administer this sacrament to certain classes without immersion and by simple affusion, and that it was uniformly and always held to be true and valid *baptism,* which it was a sin to think of repudiating or to treat as not Christian baptism. Does not this prove and demonstrate forever that the Baptists do but quote their own condemnation by appealing to patristic practice? Though they commonly immersed, they found adequate Christian baptism where there was no immersion: therefore, baptism with them was not sheer immersion and nothing else.

And what is exceedingly remarkable in this

connection, though these ancient Christians generally baptized by immersion, we know of no instance—and, with all the searching of our industrious Baptist writers, there has not come to light one single instance—in which any one of them attempted to sustain or defend their practice by reference to the meaning of the word or to the practice of the apostles. Upon this point we will give an extract from the learned Greville Ewing: —"That, in the days when Churches in every nation were running the race of superstitious observance, and vying with one another who should be readiest to adopt every new clerical and monkish device, the Greeks speedily embraced the method of baptism by immersion, is matter of undoubted notoriety. But that they either practiced this method from the beginning, or, even when they embraced it, alleged as their reason the meaning of the word *Baptism*, there is no evidence which I have been able to discover. I have looked in vain for it into all the earliest Greek Fathers to which I have had access; and, so far as my acquaintance with the Baptist writers extends, I must say that they are on this point remarkably barren. Mr. Robinson satisfies himself with making the bare assertion without giving a single reference in support of it. Dr. Ryland, who has given so many quotations from Jewish and heathen writers, confines himself to three from the Greek Fathers. Two of these are brought to prove what we have admitted,—that *baptizo* signifies *to sink and be drowned;* but they have no reference to the ordinance of baptism,

and they are so vaguely quoted that *it is impossible to find the passages.*" (P. 141.) "The idea of immersion in baptism seems to have arisen among the *Latin* (*not Greek*) Fathers of Africa; and that not from their opinion of the meaning of the original words of the institution, but from their unwarrantable zeal for *improving* on the simplicity of that and of all the other institutions of Christianity." (P. 84.)

It is also worthy of remark that there arose a sect in the fourth century, called the Eunomians, which embraced men as distinguished for learning and penetration as any who lived in that period, who denounced the custom of immersing candidates for baptism as an unwarrantable departure from the primitive mode of administering this ordinance, and insisted that baptism was only rightly performed by wetting the head and shoulders.

Nor is it to be forgotten that when the early Christians immersed their subjects they immersed them *in perfect nakedness.* Whether male or female, old or young, immersion was never performed unless the candidate had first been divested of every particle of clothing. This is a fact, established upon the very best authority and admitted by Baptists themselves. It cannot be successfully denied. And immersion for Christian baptism has no records in history which are not inseparably connected with the custom of bringing people to baptism as naked as they came into the world. This one fact, with its indecency, ought to be proof enough that immersion did not origin-

ate in the purity of scriptural ordinances, but in the rudeness of growing superstition. It arose at a time when a barbarous but ambitious clergy presumed to enjoin submission to whatever their wild imaginations might suggest for introduction. The fact is that this indecent undressing for baptism had a foundation about as respectable, as well as an antiquity as great, as the custom of immersion itself. If immersion in water could set forth the death and burial and resurrection of Christ, the unclothing of the person baptized did much better set forth the putting off of the body of sin in order to put on the new man, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. So that, if the common practice of the Fathers is of any value in proving what is essential to baptism, it proves equally that this total divesture is just as essential as the total immersion.

We here also mention the fact that there is a Christian society now in existence which dates back to the remotest Christian antiquity, and so far removed from the common world as to have felt little of the conflicts of opinion or of the operations of ambition, which have made such sad havoc with larger communities and interests,—to a community of whom it is not too much to say that they have retained the practices derived from their forefathers much more punctiliously than the perturbed nations of Christendom at large. We refer to the Syrian Christians in India. Cosmos Indicopleustes found them there in A.D. 540, a certain Theophilus in 356, and mention is made of one of their bishops as early as 180. Good authority says that they were

first converted by the personal labors of some of the apostles in the very region they still inhabit. Mr. Newell, an American missionary, visited them in 1814. He says, "I made particular inquiry respecting *the mode* of baptism. *I found it was* AFFUSION. Respecting the *subjects* of baptism I made no inquiry, as I supposed it was a matter of notoriety that the Syrians are *Pedobaptists*. Bro. Hall, who conversed with those same priests when he was at Cochin, understood that children were baptized."

"The History of Baptism" furnishes no support for the cause of immersionist philology.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE PRACTICE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

OUR Baptist friends are very fond of referring to the practice of the so-called Greek Church upon this subject. They also manage to present the case so as to take advantage of the ignorance of many people and persuade them that such an appeal is a complete and unanswerable settlement of the whole controversy.

Mr. Robinson, in his History of Baptism, chapter second, thus presents the matter:—"The word is confessedly Greek; and native Greeks must understand their own language better than foreigners; and they have always understood the word

baptism to signify dipping; and, therefore, from their first embracing Christianity to this day, they have always baptized, and do yet baptize, by immersion. This is an authority for the meaning of the word baptize infinitely preferable to that of European lexicographers; so that a man who is obliged to trust human testimony, and baptizes by immersion because the Greeks do, understands a Greek word exactly as the Greeks themselves understand it: and in this case the Greeks are unexceptionable guides."

All this appears exceedingly plausible. Mr. Ewing says he has no doubt it has caused the immersion of thousands. Nay, if it were true, it would put other nations in the ridiculous attitude of undertaking to dispute with the Greeks the meaning of their own language. We shall show presently that the whole thing is apocryphal.

Dr. Fuller presents the case in these words:— "In inquiring into the import of a Greek word, the following questions must at once suggest themselves to the mind of every man:—Is the Greek language now spoken by any nation? If it be, why not refer the point to them, since they must know what is the meaning of the word? Now, the Greek language is still essentially a living language. The word *baptizo* is still used by the Greeks, and they mock to utter scorn the absurdity of supposing that it means sprinkle or pour. They employ terms of contempt for those practices, and always immerse any members who join their Churches from other Churches where they have

only received sprinkling or pouring. This point is conceded by all." (Pp. 87, 88.)

To the illiterate and unsuspecting, this too would seem like a just and final disposition of the whole controversy. Many, no doubt, think that it is quite enough to settle any one's mind in favor of immersionism. But "thereby hangs a tale," which remains to be told, and the Baptist logic on this point vanishes forever. It is mere sophistry.

1. Modern Greek is not the ancient Greek,—very little, if any, more than Italian is like ancient Latin. This is a fact which no scholar will deny.

2. *The great body of the so-called Greek Church does not speak Greek at all, and never has spoken Greek,* AND IS IN NO WAY CONNECTED WITH GREEK ANCESTRY. The head and trunk of the so-called Greek Church is the Russian Empire; and out of a population of sixty-seven millions composing that empire, not four millions are of Greek extraction; and *not the one-tenth of those* know any thing about Greek!

3. It is not the fact that the Greek Christians have "always understood the word baptism to signify dipping." Clemens Alexandrinus was a Greek Christian; and he applies the word to denote purifyings by wetting the body, by washing the hands, and by sprinkling around and over one on a couch. Cyril was a Greek Christian; yet he calls the purification by the sprinkling of the ashes of the heifer under the Jewish law a baptism. Origen was a Greek Christian; and he calls the shedding of Christ's blood a baptism, and says that martyrdom is rightfully called a baptism, and that the

pouring of the water on the wood and altar in Elijah's time was a *baptizing* of it. Nicephorus was a Greek Christian; and he tells of a man who received the ordinance of induction into Christ by *affusion*, while lying upon his bed, and calls the transaction *baptism*. Athanasius was a Greek Christian; and he says that "John was *baptized* by placing his hand on the divine head of his Master." Zonarus and Balzamon were Greek Christians; and yet the occurrence of *baptizo*, in the sense of immersion, in a canon of the Apostolic Constitutions, as they are called, so arrested their attention that they thought it necessary to insert notes to prevent the reader from mistaking its meaning in that place.

Besides these cases, the native Greek lexicographers, setting themselves to explain the meaning of Greek for the Greeks, and acknowledged and received by the Greeks as competent interpreters of their native tongue, have not given dip or immerse as the meaning of *baptizo*. Hesychius gives the stem-word, and defines it and all proceeding from it by the one word *antleo,—to draw, pump, or pour water*. Suidas defines *baptizo* by the one word *pluno,—to wet, wash, cleanse, or bathe in any manner*. And Gases defines it by *brecho, louo, antleo,—to wet, wash, draw, or pour out water*.

To say, then, that the Greek Church has "always understood the word baptism to signify dipping," is a mistake, a sheer assumption, a positive contradiction of the truth. It is not so.

4. The Greek Church adheres most tenaciously to the baptism of infants, so much so that an adult

baptism is a rare thing among them. And, if their practice is authority to fix *the mode*, it is equal authority to fix *the subject*, of baptism. It is just as uniform and decisive in the one point as in the other. Either, then, our Baptist friends must repudiate the authority of the Greek Church practice altogether, or criminate themselves with delinquency in some important parts of the baptismal service, and of stinting and abrogating God's ordinance as applied to children. This is an extremity to which they reduce themselves by this mode of argument; and truth and justice require that they be sternly held to it.

5. Dr. Fuller says that the Greek Churches always rebaptize any members who join them from other Churches where they have received sprinkling or pouring. Why did he not have the manliness to state the true reason? Would they admit Dr. Fuller, or any other Baptist, without rebaptism? He does not say they would; and we say, positively, *they would not*. Why? Simply because they acknowledge no Churches but their own, whether they be immersionist Churches or not. The Greek Churches are *episcopal*, and admit no succession, no authorized ministry, but their own. They hold the whole Western Church as apostate. They will allow no Christianity but theirs. Hence, whoever comes to join them must be baptized by their clergy and in their own forms, no matter how or by whom he had been baptized before. Dr. Fuller's immersions are no better in their eyes than the sprinklings of the Papists. They hold them all equally invalid. So that if

Greek Church practice is to decide the matter, there is no true baptism under heaven but that performed by themselves. Our Baptist brethren must go to St. Petersburg for the genuine succession before they are competent to administer baptism as understood by these so-called Greeks.

6. *The mode of baptism in the Greek Churches is not by total immersion.* Baptists have with great confidence asserted that it is; but, like many of their assertions, it is without proof. It is only upon loose, vague, and unsupported *impressions* that their allegation rests. We will furnish testimony which proves those impressions to be unfounded. "Mere assertion is a proof only for fools," says a certain writer: *proof* is what we want, especially "in a matter of such moment as obedience to Jesus Christ."

Mr. Joseph Huber, a ruling elder in the Danville Presbyterian Church, and afterward a minister of the Presbyterian Church, some forty years ago resided among people of the Greek Church, and furnishes the following statement:—

"I resided upwards of three years in the capital of the Grand Seignior's dominions, in a Greek family of the first respectability. During that time *I was present at four baptisms*,—two in the family and two in the immediate neighborhood. It is the custom among the Greeks either to have their children baptized publicly in their churches, or else in their houses; in which latter case the parents invite the nearest relations and neighbors; and, after the ceremony, while refreshments pass round, the father gives to each person present a token of wit-

nesship, consisting of a small piece of Turkish money through which a hole is pierced and a piece of narrow ribbon inserted. I was thus invited to attend the four above-mentioned baptisms: and I still have in my possession two tokens; the other two may be seen in Mrs. McDowell's Museum in Danville. The company were all seated on the sofas around the room. A table stood in the middle with *a basin of water on it.* The papa or priest was then sent for, who upon entering the room was received by the father of the infant and led to the baptismal water, which he consecrated by a short prayer and the sign of the cross; then the mother presented to him her babe, *which he laid on his left arm, and, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, he thrice dipped* HIS HAND *into the water and* DROPPED SOME OF IT ON THE CHILD'S FOREHEAD, *giving it a name.*

"I may remark here," he adds, "that I never heard, during my stay in Constantinople, of adult baptisms, *nor of the ordinance being performed by immersion in a single instance.* Most generally infants are baptized in the churches. Before the altar stands a tripod holding *a basin of consecrated water for baptisms.*"

Here were native Greeks, members of the Greek Church, "holding to the good old practice of the ancient Church;" yet they baptized infants, and they did it by dropping water upon the subject. "Can it be affirmed," says the Baptist Recorder, "that the Greeks did not understand their own language?" But this is not all.

The Rev. Pliny Fisk, missionary to Palestine

some years ago, says, "I went one morning to the Syrian church to witness a baptism. . . . When ready for the baptism, the font was uncovered, and a small quantity, first of warm water and then of cold, was poured into it. The child, in a state of perfect nudity, was then taken by the bishop, who held it in one hand, while with the other he anointed the whole body with oil. He then held the child in the font, *its feet and legs being in the water, and* WITH HIS RIGHT HAND *he took up water* AND POURED IT ON THE CHILD, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." (Memoir of Fisk, p. 357.)

These baptisms occurred in the East, where the climate is favorable to immersion. We can hardly suppose that there is more to do with the water when we come north and west to St. Petersburg. Nay, Dr. B. Kurtz, in his first tour through Europe in 1825, says, "*We ourselves once witnessed the baptism of an infant in the great cathedral of St. Petersburg,* BY POURING." And so Deylingius, as quoted in Booth's "Pedobaptism Examined," says, "*The Greeks at this day practice* A KIND OF AFFUSION."

Some indeed tell us that the Greek Church totally immerses the candidate before the ceremony of affusing or sprinkling him; but we have seen no accounts of this from eye-witnesses. We seriously doubt it. If it is so, the fact might easily be ascertained and the evidence of it produced. It has not been forthcoming. The inference is that it does not exist. And, if it does exist, it is no baptism in the estimation of the Greek Church without being followed by the public application of water to the

subject with *the hand*, in the name of the Holy Trinity. AFFUSION CANNOT BE SEPARATED FROM GREEK CHURCH BAPTISM.

We then hold our Baptist friends down to their own argument,—that the practice of the Greeks shows their understanding of the Greek word. The practice of the Greeks at least includes *affusion* or *sprinkling:* therefore *the Greeks understood* BAPTIZO *to include affusion and sprinkling.*

So much for the practice of the so-called Greek Church.

CHAPTER XIX.

DEVELOPMENTS AND TENDENCIES OF THE BAPTIST DOGMA.

WE have now examined every point in Dr. Fuller's "philological inquiry as to the meaning of *baptizo.*" The result is before the reader. We do not deem it more than the naked truth to say that we have found him contradicting plain facts, interpolating historical records, giving for Scripture what is not in Scripture, perverting authorities, wresting inspired language from its obvious import, charging the best and wisest men who have ever lived with a spurious Christianity, seeking to bind down the glorious blessings of Christ's mediation to a mere *accident* of external ceremony, sending us back to the old heathen to learn whether we are Christians or not, at every step

using logic which is unsound and making assertions which are untenable, denouncing the most solemn sacraments of ninety-five hundredths of God's people for more than a thousand years as superstition or profanity, and holding up a heterogeneous community of modern sectarians as the only true Church of God on earth. A cause which drives its advocate to such extremities can never command the respect of candid thinkers.

In six general arguments we have shown that all the presumptions and *primâ facie* considerations in the case lie so strong and heavy against the Baptist theory of immersion that nothing short of demonstrative proof is competent to set them aside. Such proof has not been found in the Baptist "Argument." Indeed, Dr. Carson himself comes to what is equivalent to an admission that no such proof is to be found inside of the New Testament. His process is, first, to establish immersion as the meaning of *baptizo* from classic Greek authors, and then to silence all objections and counter-arguments drawn from the Scriptures by alleging the possibility—the mere *possibility—that the baptisms of the New Testament* MAY HAVE BEEN *immersions.* This is all that he pretends to get from the New Testament on the subject. Positive proof he does not once claim to find in the inspired record. (See his work on Baptism, pp. 281, 282.) Either, then, the Scriptures are not that sufficient guide which Paul (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17) claims that they are, or the doctrine of immersionists is not a doctrine of the New Testament. Many may honestly entertain it and take it for the truth

of God; but it is nevertheless wholly unsupported by the origin or use of the word relied on, at war with the strongest scriptural intimations concerning mode in baptizing, and incongruous with the whole tone and spirit of the gospel. It is no part of Christianity.

Nay, the nature and tendencies of the immersionist dogma, when fully seen, present it in a light which prove it to be of other than divine origin. The spirit of Christ, of liberty, of charity, of goodness, is not in it. It has its life and power in what is as unchristian as it is Pharisaic, superstitious, and sectarian.

It excludes the repenting sick from the privilege of confessing Christ in his own appointed mark of discipleship and sacrament of forgiveness.

It does the same in the case of those members of our race whom the gospel may reach in arid deserts where it is difficult to find water enough to sustain life, or in those polar realms where unmitigated winter reigns for nearly all the year, locking up every stream in perpetual ice, covering the surface of the deep with solidity, and rendering the immersion of a man in water the instantaneous conversion of him into a statue of frozen flesh and blood. God or his apostles would never have instituted or *made binding* any *particular mode* which could not be *universally* and *at all times practised.*

It destroys the solemnity and disturbs the devotion which ought to attend the administration of the baptismal sacrament, often converting an ordinance of God into a mere *show* for the amuse-

ment of curious people, boys, and servants, giving point to the jests of the vulgar and bringing pain to the feelings of the devout. Dr. Fuller, with all his studied sanctity of manner, the elegances of music, the assistance of waiting friends, the concealment of the rising subject's face, the considerate interposition of his own robed person to cover the sorry retreat of his candidates from the pool, and all the shields and graces which his ingenuity can throw around it, cannot deprive immersion of its liability to the charge which we are compelled, from personal observation, to make upon it.

It also subverts the order of the gospel, exalting the ritual above what is personal, placing the form above the substance, making spiritual qualifications nothing unless accompanied by submission to a mere puncto of external ceremony, and engrafting Levitical bondage upon evangelical freedom. It leads to the denunciation of the most solemn official acts of the greatest and most pious ministers that have ever lived as profanity and lies not to be respected for a moment. It obscures the vital doctrines of the Christian faith, by displacing and supplanting them in the pulpit and in the common mind by mere questions of outward formalities, which can profit nothing. It begets a superstitious regard for the rite of baptism itself, as though salvation were to be obtained in the water. It was so in the fourth and fifth centuries. It is so now in the case of the Campbellites and in the cases of very many individual Baptists. Dr. Fuller himself has not escaped this tendency of his system. "*Saved or damned!*" are the first words

in his book; and if salvation and damnation are not associated in his mind with submission and refusal to go under the water, or if he does not in some way regard this momentous question as involved in immersion, it is contemptible hypocrisy, if not downright profanity, to introduce an argument on immersion with such words, amplified, too, as if this were the question to be decided. Meet a zealous Baptist where you will, and immersion is obtruded upon you as a theme paramount to all others. Nearly every Baptist preacher who has learned to decline *Ho,* and many a Baptist preacher who knows not what *Ho* is, must needs write a book, tract, or something else on *immersion,* just as though that embodied the essence of Christianity, or as if it were the ultimatum of ministerial effort to hold up above every thing else this one matter of simple *form.* Stoutly as it may be denied,

> "Ho, every mother's son and daughter!
> Here's salvation in the water!"

are lines which express what may be seen in the spirit of Baptist literature, preaching, and conversation,—the fruit of a deep-seated tendency in their system to divert the mind from the vital elements of saving religion to a superstitious and fanatical regard for an insignificant mode of performing an outward ceremony.

Out of thirteen of the publications of the "Southern Baptist Publication Society," including hymn-books and rhymes and conversations for children, *four* are on the subject of baptism. The editor of the Baptist paper of Baltimore concedes that out

of one hundred and seventy volumes, including Sabbath-school books and biographies, published by the "American Baptist Publication Society," nineteen are strictly on "the baptismal question," and that, out of two hundred and seven *Tracts*, twenty are exclusively "denominational"!

Professor Eaton, in a speech before the Baptist American and Foreign Bible Society, April 28, 1840, says, "Never, sir, was there a chord struck that vibrated simultaneously through so many Baptist hearts from one extremity of the land to the other, as when it was announced that *the heathen world must look to them alone for an unvailed view of the glories of the Gospel of Christ.* . . . A deep conviction seized the minds of almost *the whole body, that they were* DIVINELY AND PECULIARLY SET *for the defence and dissemination of the gospel* as delivered to man by its heavenly Author."

It is the foster-mother of a spirit of proselytism and sectarianism, which is ever on the look-out for a convert to its party, creeping insidiously into houses, and "leading captive silly women" *of both sexes*, and which would glory in draining every church and destroying every congregation in Christendom which refuses to bow to its narrow dictation.

It has led to the public and formal denunciation of the great Bible societies of Britain and America —those two wings of the Apocalyptic angel with the everlasting gospel to preach to every kindred, people, and tongue—as "*combinations to obscure the divine revelation.*"

It has led its adherents and supporters to arrogate to themselves the high distinction of being,

of all Christian people, *the only ones* sufficiently honest and conscientious to translate intelligibly those passages of Scripture which relate to the baptismal sacrament. Witness the resolution of the Baptist American and Foreign Bible Society, passed on the 28th of April, 1840, which reads, "Resolved, That in the fact [!] that *the nations of the earth must now look to the Baptist denomination* ALONE *for faithful translations of the word of God,* a responsibility is imposed upon them, demanding for its full discharge an unwonted degree of union, of devotion, and of strenuous, persevering effort throughout the entire body." Might not the spirit which dictated and sustained that resolve take, for the motto of its devotions, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men"?

It leads to the intolerant proscription of all, however devout of heart and meek in spirit and munificent in charity, who do not embrace it.

It has engendered in its devotees a bigotry, intolerance, and self-sufficiency which Robert Hall, though a Baptist, saw, lamented, and sought to counteract, as being the same in essence and equally reprehensible with the most arrogant and antichristian assumptions of the Papacy itself.

It has led, according to the testimony of that eloquent man of God, to "glaring instances of gross violation as well of the dictates of inspiration as of the maxims of Christian antiquity,—both of which," says he, "concur in inculcating the doctrine of the absolute unity of the Church, and of the *horrible incongruity*—I might almost say *impiety*—of attempting to establish a system which

represents a great majority of its members as personally disqualified for communion."

It falsifies the words of Jesus that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church, by assuming grounds which necessarily render that Church extinct for hundreds of years, and which, if true, make it extremely doubtful whether there is now anywhere under the whole heaven any such thing as a true, legitimate, historical Christian Church.

Can such a theory, with such tendencies, plead scriptural warrant? Can the immaculate Son of God be the author of such a system? Can Heaven be the origin of such doctrine? Can Jehovah be the parent of such confusion? To say so would be to slander the great God, to obscure the attributes of his love and mercy, to throw discredit upon his word, to cast contempt upon his gospel, and to divide his kingdom against itself. We cannot believe it. It is too much for the most fanatical credulity. It is an outrage upon common sense. It is Papal arrogance in the guise of Protestant humility. We pity the people who have suffered themselves to be imposed on and infatuated by it. We honor and sympathize with them as Christians, so far as they show a Christian temper and walk. Many of them are doubtless good men and true and accepted of God; but they are giving their sanction to a system the bearings of which are as contrary to the spirit of the gospel and as antagonistic to some of its clearest dictates as error is to truth or sin to holiness; a system which leads them to call a man a

minister of Jesus whilst they denounce all his administrations as invalid and sinful and seek to alienate the people from him as a deceiver and apostate; a system which leads them to flatter a man as a Christian friend with one breath and with the next deny to him the hope of salvation save as they extend it to the unbaptized heathen; a system which leads them at times to take a man by the hand as a fellow-disciple of Jesus, and then to *turn him away from the Lord's table like a dog.*

And this, we are to be told, is Christianity *par excellence,*—the religion of Christ direct from his word and Spirit,—the pure, unadulterated gospel of the blessed God,—the very flower and perfection of that economy of holiness, love, liberty, and universal brotherhood of which the holy seers of old did sing, and for which the heart of humanity in all ages has been yearning, hoping, and praying! "Oh, tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of Askelon; lest the Philistines rejoice and the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph!"

As we shall all answer at the great day of judgment, CAN SUCH A SYSTEM BE THE TRUTH OF GOD?

CHAPTER XX.

ANALOGY—AN INDEPENDENT ARGUMENT.

Before closing our remarks upon this part of the Baptist controversy, we have another argument to present,—an argument from analogy,—an argument quite independent of the preceding discussion, and so direct, complete and conclusive that no Baptist writer, so far as we are aware, has ever so much as attempted to answer it.

We think that we have demonstrated that no reliance is to be placed upon the doctrine of our Baptist friends that "*baptizo* means immerse and nothing else." But we are now about to submit a mode of reasoning which has no need of that demonstration, which exempts us entirely from the necessity of replying at all to the teachings of immersionists as to the secular, classical, and common meaning of the word in dispute. We may grant that the Greeks ordinarily used *baptizo* to signify immersion, and that all its meanings are properly resolvable into this. We may dispense with entirely and wholly set aside the conclusions which we have thus far educed; and yet there is a mode of reasoning, to which no just exception can possibly be taken, which entirely confounds the Baptist claim, and establishes a bulwark of

strength around our mode of baptism which renders it forever invulnerable against all the immersionist logic in the world.

It is agreed on all hands that, under the present dispensation, Christ has established two corresponding ordinances or sacraments: the one is *Baptism* and the other *The Lord's Supper*,—the one referring to the new birth, the other to the nurture and nourishment of this new creature. All the essentials of a positive ordinance or Christian sacrament appertain alike to both. Both have Christ's positive command; both require the use of an external, material, and tangible element; both are of binding and continual obligation; both have the divine promise of grace to those who attend properly upon them; both are meant to exhibit and apply the gospel to the souls of men; and both are equally solemn, sacred, and unalterable. The one is denoted by the word *deipnon*, *supper;* the other by the word *baptisma*, *baptism*. *Baptisma* does not more describe the nature or essential constituents of the one than *deipnon* describes the other. It is no more allowable, then, for us to depart from the strict meaning of *deipnon* in our celebration of the Holy Supper than to depart from the strict meaning of *baptisma* in baptizing. The stringency or laxity that is requisite or allowable must be the same in both cases; for they are exactly analogous. If it is not necessary to keep to the literal meaning of the one, it is not necessary to keep to the literal meaning of the other. Liberty in the one case presupposes and implies the existence of the right to exercise

the same liberty in the other case. This cannot be successfully disputed.

Supposing, then, that the immersionists are right in claiming that mode is implied in *baptism*, if we can show that they, in common with the Churches generally, from the beginning until now, consider themselves under no obligation to keep to the plain, literal import of the word *deipnon* in the Holy Supper, that fact alone, without any other argument, is a satisfactory and unanswerable ground upon which to claim exemption from rigid adherence to the literal meaning of *baptisma* in baptizing. Sound authority in one case is sound authority in every parallel case.

What, then, is the meaning of *deipnon?* There is but little room for diversity as to the true answer. *It denotes* A FULL MEAL, and that an *evening meal.* All authorities agree that it stands for the principal meal of the Greeks and Romans. Three names of meals occur in the Homeric writings, in the following order,—*ariston, deipnon,* and *dorpon.* "The Greeks of a later age usually partook of three meals, called *akratisma, ariston,* and *deipnon. The last,* which corresponds to the *dorpon* of the Homeric poems, *was the evening meal, or dinner;* the *ariston* was the luncheon; and the *akratisma,* which answers to the *ariston* of Homer, was the early meal, or breakfast. The *akratisma* was taken immediately after rising in the morning. Next followed the *ariston,* or luncheon; but the time at which it was taken is uncertain. Suidas says that it was taken about the third hour; that is, about nine o'clock in the morning;

but this account does not agree with the statements of other ancient writers. We may conclude, from many circumstances, that this meal was taken about the middle of the day, and answered to the Roman *prandium.* THE PRINCIPAL MEAL, HOWEVER, WAS THE DEIPNON. *It was usually taken rather late in the day,—frequently not before sunset.*" (Smith's Antiquities, pp. 303, 304.) Dr. Halley says, "Long before the apostolic age, *deipnon* had become regularly and constantly *the evening meal.*" Nitzch says that it denoted "*the principal meal.*" Trench does the same. Hence, all great entertainments were called *deipna,* and always came off at the latter part of the day, or at night.

The scope and use of the word in the New Testament correspond exactly to these representations, as may be seen from the following passages:—

Matt. xxiii. 6: "They make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the uppermost rooms at *feasts,* [*deipnois, suppers.*]"

Mark vi. 21: "Herod on his birthday made a *supper* [*deipnon*] to his lords, high captains, and chief estates of Galilee."

Mark xii. 39: "The scribes love the uppermost rooms at *feasts* [*deipnois, suppers.*]"

Luke xiv. 12: "When thou makest *a dinner* [*ariston*] or *a supper* [*deipnon*], call not thy friends; . . . but when thou makest *a feast,*" &c.

Luke xiv. 16: "A certain man made a great *supper* [*deipnon*] and bade many." (See also verses 17, 24, and chapter xx. 46.)

John xii. 2: "There they made him *a supper*

[*deipnon*], and Martha served." (See also chapters xiii. 2, 4, and xxi. 20, where the word occurs in the same sense.)

We might further illustrate this meaning from the Septuagint, in such passages as Daniel v. 1:—"Belshazzar the king made a great *feast* [*deipnon, supper*] to a thousand of his lords;" but it is unnecessary. *Deipnon* means *a full meal, a banquet, a plentiful supper, an ample repast,* THE PRINCIPAL AND MOST ABUNDANT MEAL OF THE DAY, *which occurred in the evening, between mid-day and midnight.* Dr. Fuller himself says, that *Deipnon* was, among the ancients, the most social and convivial of all their repasts," and that "the word means A BANQUET, A FEAST." (P. 226.)

It is also to be observed that *the Lord's* Supper, or *deipnon*, was instituted and first celebrated *at night.* Not only the meaning of the word which was chosen to describe it, but the very hour of its appointment and first observance, connect the Lord's *Supper* with the evening and the close of the day.

According to the plain, evident, and well-established meaning of words, therefore, and sustained by circumstances, two things would be essential to the sacramental *deipnon.* First, *it must be a full and plenteous meal;* and, second, *it must be taken in the evening.* A fragment of bread a half-inch square, and a sip of wine that would scarcely fill a tea-spoon, is not a *deipnon*, as the Greeks used that word, any more than sprinkling a few drops of water on a man's face is an immersion of him. Neither do we eat our *suppers* in the morning. It is as great

a contradiction in terms and confusion of ideas to speak of *supping in the morning* as to speak of plunging a man by pouring water on him.

Suppose, then, that we were to set ourselves to reason on the word *deipnon* as the immersionists reason on the word *baptisma:* we might make out a case to convict the Christian world in all ages of disobedience to a plain command of Christ. They say that *baptisma* means immersion and nothing else; we say that still more certainly does *deipnon* mean *an evening repast.* If the one denotes *mode,* the other with more certainty denotes *time.* They insist that *baptisma* includes in itself a total covering up of the whole body in water; we say, with far more reason and confidence, that *deipnon* includes in itself the provision and participation of the largest and fullest meal. If the one requires water enough to cover a man, the other, with greater certainty, requires food enough to *fill a man* and as many as are to partake of it. The words chosen in both are the words of God, and he knew what he meant by them. And if the common Greek usage of *baptisma* was to denote immersion, and we are to get God's meaning in that word from common Greek usage, the common Greek usage of *deipnon* must also give us the idea attached to *it* by the Holy Ghost.

What, then, has been the universal practice of the Church with regard to the sacramental *deipnon?* Have there ever been any denominations of Christians who believed, or held it as necessary to a right communion, that it should be celebrated in the evening or that it should be made a full meal? All parties

—Baptists with all others—are continually celebrating the *deipnon* of the Savior *in the morning;* and none of them provide for it more than *a bit of bread and a sip of wine for each communicant.* We do not find fault with this. We believe that it adequately fulfills the mind of the Spirit and of Jesus on the subject. But, arguing as our modern immersionists, we might say, with holy indignation, What right have men to trample upon and ignore *the time* selected by the Savior in the institution of this sacrament and ingrained in the name given to it by the Spirit of inspiration? What authority have they to make a pitiable abortion of a *breakfast* or *dinner* of what, according to the plain common import of God's word, is to be an abundant and plentiful *supper?* If we cannot dispense with *mode* in baptism, we cannot dispense with *time* in its corresponding sacrament. If we cannot have baptism without immersion, for the same alleged reason we cannot have a supper in the morning or a *deipnon* for a hundred guests without a large supply of wine and bread. If time and quantity are nothing in the one sacrament, the name and circumstances of which call for it, mode and quantity are nothing in the other sacrament, the name and circumstances of which demand it still less.

Assuming, then, that *mode* is invariably and essentially implied in the literal sense of *baptisma,* which we have abundantly proven to be otherwise, the sin of those who practice sprinkling, wetting, or affusion in baptism consists simply in regarding *mode* as one of the accidents or circumstantials in

this ordinance. This is all. And, if we are to suffer for this, we have a right to demand, with the Psalmist, "Let *the righteous smite us;* it shall be a kindness: and let *him* reprove us; it shall be an excellent oil, which shall not break our heads." If our iniquity in this thing is to be punished with death, then let our Baptist friends consider the Savior's challenge:—"*He that is without sin among you, let him cast the first stone.*" If they will insist that we distort and violate an ordinance of Christ by declining to be immersed or to immerse, we take the liberty of "holding the mirror up to nature," that their flagrant inconsisteney may be seen. They have expunged the elements of *time* and *quantity* from the ordinance of the Lord's Supper as celebrated in their societies, and think they have done no violence to literal exposition and the plain meaning of words which certainly contain them; and it will not answer for them now to turn about and condemn and excommunicate us for thinking it non-essential as to how the water is applied in holy baptism. Let them ponder first those searching words of Jesus:—"Why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me pull out the mote out of thine eye; and, behold, a beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite! *first cast out the beam out of thine own eye,* and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

The immersionist attempts to defend the peculiarity of his procedure by asserting that mode is

inseparable from *baptism* and therefore belongs essentially to the ordinance. We say that his argument criminates himself, and, by proving too much, recoils upon his own head. Time and abundance of provisions are as necessarily included in *deipnon* as it is possible for mode to be in *baptisma;* and when he gives us the warrant for his liberty to eject *time* from the Lord's Supper, and for his substitution of a little fragment of bread and a little sip of wine for a full meal, we shall be prepared to establish our right to dispense with his favorite mode in the administration of baptism. Until he does this, all his philological reasonings on the word *baptism* are completely nullified, and, in all justice, forever silent.

We need no other argument. This in itself sufficiently disposes of the question. It winds up the whole controversy into a nutshell. It puts the dispute in a light in which there is no room for philological mystification and which may easily be understood. It concedes the whole Baptist assumption, and yet completely confutes the inference founded upon it and leaves the cause of immersionism in inextricable embarrassments. It settles the case. IT IS AN UNANSWERED AND UNANSWERABLE ARGUMENT.

With these observations we close our discussion upon *mode.*

CHAPTER XXI.

INFANT BAPTISM NO SIN.

We come now to the second point of difference between immersionists and the Church general. It relates to *pedobaptism*, or the baptism of infants and little children.

This is an important department of this controversy, presenting a question which deserves to be carefully and dispassionately considered. If the position assumed by our immersionist friends be correct, a very great revolution in the views and practices of Christians generally is imperiously demanded. There is serious error on the one side or the other. And, as we have proposed to ourselves the task of giving a *resumé* of the whole Baptist controversy, it remains for us to enter somewhat upon this point also.

The first thing we notice in our opponents with reference to the baptism of infants is the wholesale and unqualified manner in which they condemn and denounce it. They show no hesitation at all in declaring it one of the most dreadful and reprehensible abominations that has ever afflicted the human race.

Mr. Kinghorn regards it as "*the very precursor of Antichrist, the inlet of almost every abomination.*"

Dr. Carson declares it to be "*the fortress of the man of sin,—the very spirit of Antichrist.*"

Dr. Ide execrates it as "*that old upas-tree which with its death-distilling branches*—popery, prelacy, and skepticism—*has for fourteen centuries shaded and blasted the world.*"

Dr. Howell declaims against it as "*an evil* which despoils the Church and subverts the doctrine of infant salvation,—which is the grand foundation of the union of Church and State, the source of religious persecutions, a hinderance to the conversion of the world, *a sin against God*, one of the most calamitous evils with which the Church has ever been visited, *the most melancholy of all evils*, AND MORE DISASTROUS TO THE CAUSE OF TRUTH AND SALVATION THAN ANY OF THE PROGENY OF SUPERSTITION"!

"The Western Baptist Recorder," printed at Louisville, Kentucky, says, "*Of all the damnable heresies* in the black catalogue which has befouled the fame of Christianity, *we consider infant baptism the most damnable. If other heresies have damned their thousands*, THIS HAS DAMNED ITS TENS OF THOUSANDS."

Dr. Fuller, with all his disavowals, chimes in with the same general strain of his brethren, denouncing infant baptism as "an antichristian practice, introducing and perpetuating the most glaring inconsistency and mischievous confusion, tarnishing the glory of the atonement, and doing vast injury to our children."

Now, all this is very expressive language. If immersionists are correct in what they say, there

never has been a curse more dreadful, or a blight more terrific, or a sin more heinous, than that involved in the solemn dedication of little innocents to the Savior who redeemed them, and the administration to them of that ordinance which he himself has appointed as the sign of his love and saving grace to those who are his. Tyranny and war and pestilence bear no comparison with it in evilness. Infanticide itself is a blessing by its side; for the one touches only the body and places the soul beyond the reach of pollution, whilst the other murders and damns the immortal spirit. We are sometimes in doubt to know whether we are to take these men as speaking in sober earnest, or whether they are merely declaiming for the benefit of a sectarian cause. But, in either case, they put themselves into a very responsible position. If they are not in sober earnest, they are trifling with the consciences and souls of men and putting forth lies in the name of God. And if they are seriously convinced of what they say, they have some very momentous settlements to make with the Christian sense and common judgment of the religious world.

1. If it is such a terrible sin, such a guilty spoliation of all that is good, to baptize children, what, then, are we to think of that long procession of good men who are acknowledged on all hands to be the lights of the world and the salt of the earth, and who have with great strenuousness adhered all their lives long to this damning heresy? Luther and Melanchthon, Knox and Howe, Leighton and Baxter, Wesley and Dod

dridge, Franke and Arndt, Brainerd and Payson, Dwight and Chalmers, and all the very flower of Christendom for hundreds and hundreds of years, have been strict Pedobaptists. They all stood up for the baptism of infants. Their names and influence were fully committed in its favor. And are we now to regard them as the enemies of the Church of Christ, the allies and abettors of Antichrist? Are we at length to set them down as the veriest sons of Belial? Where, then, has the Church of Jesus been for so many ages? What becomes of the holy faith and lauded virtue of the martyrs who cheerfully laid down their lives out of love for Jesus? What hope could they have with this sin of baptizing little children upon them, unrepented of and unforgiven? Where, then, shall we find the Joshuas and Elis and Ezras and Davids and Jeremiahs and Daniels of the gospel ages? Has the world all this time mistaken them? Must we at length reverse the sentiments of love and grateful praise which generations have inscribed upon their tombs, and cast out their names as the pests of time, and think of them now as the tenants of eternal perdition? God of our fathers, has it come to this? Yes, it has, if the doctrines of modern Baptists on the baptizing of infants be true. Alas! who can set limits to sectarian fanaticism?

2. If infant baptism is this "damnable heresy" which immersionists declare it to be,—if it is such a crying abomination, such a scarlet dragon, dripping from head to foot with the blood of souls,—the Scriptures must certainly take some notice of

it or give some cautions against it. An apostasy so fearful, a heresy so terrific, wide-spread, and long-continued, could not have been overlooked in Christ's word of warning to the Churches. Otherwise, revelation would be an insufficient guide, and does not thoroughly furnish us for every good work. But do the Scriptures refer to it? Not a writer against Pedobaptism has ever brought forward one single word of inspiration cautioning against it or in the least condemning it. With all their enthusiasm, research, and sectarian zeal, they have not even *pretended* that the Bible contains such a passage. Against popery, schism, and skepticism, against evil in all its Protean shapes, and against abuses of divine ordinances of all forms and grades, the Scriptures present the fullest and most overwhelming array. But here is a thing which we are told is the most mischievous of errors,—the most melancholy of all the progeny of superstition,—a death-distilling upas, blasting the earth for almost one-third of its age, —the parent of popery, superstition, and unbelief, spreading ruin and damnation over all the face of Christendom from the beginning until now; and yet not a word to be found against it in the Bible, not an allusion to it in the prophecies, and not a precept in all God's revelation to protect the devout parent from it! Can such a thing be possible? Is not this very silence of the Holy Ghost proof enough that infant baptism is not and cannot be that blasting curse and damning sin described in Baptist writings on this subject?

3. And then again: if the baptizing of infants

be so sinful and damning, we have a right to know in what the strength or substance of the crime lies. What is sin? Inspiration answers, "*Sin* is the transgression of the law." "Where no law is, there is no transgression." But what law is transgressed in infant baptism? Can a single precept of God be pointed out as violated by it?

Take the law of parental obligation and duty. Does the baptism of infants in any way transgress it? No: it inculcates, enforces, and seeks to fulfill it by a solemn and formal acknowledgment.

Take the law of personal responsibility. Does infant baptism violate this? No; for this too it acknowledges in all its rightful amplitude, and marks the child as the Lord's from its very infancy and binds it over to be his follower and servant. It may be said that such a covenant has no binding force, because the child does not voluntarily participate in making it. We answer, if this law is to prevail, then there is no obligation, either to God or man, except so far as an individual voluntarily chooses to have it so. It makes our consent the essence of responsibility,—which is a doctrine we repudiate and abhor, as contrary to all Scripture and common sense. God's laws are the same upon saint and sinner. They are as binding upon him who does not consent to them as upon him who does. And as well might we say that a child is not lawfully under parental control, or not bound to obey the laws of the land in which it was born and lives, because it was not

first consulted as to who should be its parents or in what country it was to be born and reared. According to all constitutions of God and man, the child follows the parent, lives the parent's life, is affected by the parent's condition, and is most intimately bound up in the parent's will. God has made it so; and no man can alter it. And when pious parents, with the aid of God's ordinance, dedicate their child to God, there is a transfer made of that child by those whom God has made its representatives, which is owned and held valid in heaven. So far, then, from repudiating, infant baptism enforces and establishes, personal responsibility. It brings vividly to view, and thus tightens up, the bonds under which all men stand to Him who made them.

Take the law of social privilege. Baptizing infants does in no way transgress it. It abridges no rightful liberty of the child. Nay, it increases the hopes and privileges of the little learner in Christ, by bringing the proper persons under expressed consent to see to its spiritual wants and training.

Take even the law of baptism and Christian discipleship itself, about which immersionists and Anabaptists make so much ado. Infant baptism in no way transgresses it. Does it specify qualifications? Christ himself finds all those qualifications in infants. "Of such," says he, "*is the kingdom of heaven.*" Nay, so perfect is every thing in the little child which is required to qualify an adult for baptism and discipleship, that he says further, "Except ye be converted *and become* as

LITTLE CHILDREN, *ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.*" Every thing required of the adult is already in the little child. *The child is the model,* so presented by the Maker of the law, and therefore morally and spiritually as much entitled to this sacramental acknowledgment of discipleship as any one can possibly be. Upon that point, then, there is no transgression. Does instruction enter into the case? There is nothing to require that instruction to precede the discipleship. It is the coming of one into the position of a learner in Christ that constitutes the discipleship; and if the baptism of infants only serves as the introduction of them to this position of learners in Christ, it fulfills all the requirements of the law.

We therefore press and reiterate the question, Where, then, is the transgression? No law is violated; and where are we to get strength for the life of this dreadful and damnable sin? No right is invaded; no privilege is abridged; no principle of morality is outraged; no precept of God is infracted. Let the law be shown on which the great world of saints is indicted; let us hear its provisions and penalties; and if we have disobeyed this consecration of our babes to God, we will repent in dust and ashes. But, until that is done, we will conclude and hold that our accusers must be mistaken zealots, and that infant baptism is neither mortal sin nor "damnable heresy."

CHAPTER XXII.

INFANT BAPTISM NOT CONTRARY TO THE COMMISSION.

Looking at the fierce and terrific accusations which immersionists bring against infant baptism, we would naturally suppose that they had some strong and positive foundation upon which to rest. We would at once expect to see an array of Scripture and reason not easy to be met. But, having examined about a dozen of the leading Baptist books upon the subject, we have been more than surprised—we have been amazed—at the lameness and barrenness of their cause. With all their parade and assurance, we have been able to find but one single positive argument that has been produced anywhere to make out their charge of "damnable heresy." It is that *the commission to baptize forbids the baptism of infants.*

Jesus says to his ministers, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." This is the commission; and on this the whole case

of the fierce assaults upon the baptizing of little children is made to repose. Dr. Carson says, "I am willing to hang the whole controversy upon this passage. . . . Even if I found another command, enjoining the baptism of the infants of believers, I should not move an inch from my position. . . . I would gainsay an angel from heaven who should say that this commission may extend to the baptism of any but believers [adults]. . . . Here I stand entrenched; and I defy the ingenuity of earth and hell to drive me from my position." (Pp. 169, 170.) Howell says, "Infant baptism is prohibited by the apostolic commission; [*i.e.* the commission given to the apostles.] This is *the law* of baptism, instituted by Christ himself, and the only law he ever ordained on the subject." (P. 33.) Dr. Fuller says "the argument from the commission is distinct, conclusive, irrevocable. Even if infant baptism could be established by other portions of the Bible, it would not, could not, be baptism under the commission." (P. 112.) And he further discourses as if it were a waste of time, a casting of pearls before swine, to attempt argument with a man who does not perceive that this commission, in spite of every thing, forever excludes and prohibits the baptizing of little children.

Now, it does appear a little strange that these men are unwilling here to allow the Scriptures to explain themselves, or even "an angel from heaven" to explain them, when, a little while ago, they considered it proper to call in the old heathen Greeks to tell us what Jesus meant, and by the pains of excommunication hold us bound to abide

by what these old heathen say. But it is useless to think of fathoming all the depths of Baptist logic. The question is, *Does this commission exclude infants from baptism?* We say that it does not. And in this we are sustained by the conviction and constant practice of the great body of Christian people from the beginning until this present moment. When Baptists assert that it does, they take issue with the whole East and with nearly the whole West. They take issue with Origen, Firmilian, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Dionysius, Cyprian, Victorinus, Lucian, Lactantius, Eusebius, Athanasius, Cyril, Hilary, Epiphanius, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine. They take issue with Huss, and Wickliffe, and Luther, and Melanchthon, and Zwingli, and the great mass of learned Christian men in all nations and ages. Dr. Fuller quotes from Grotius, Calvin, Barrow, Saurin, Vossius, Doddridge, Limboreh, Whitby, Venema, and Baxter, as if they were authorities in his favor; but what are they, compared with the list which we have given, and which might be swelled to twenty times the extent? Nay, every one of these men to whom he has referred approved, practiced, and advocated the baptizing of infants, and therefore could not have believed with him that this commission excludes them. If the question, therefore, is to be decided by authority, it is already settled, by a perfect avalanche of the greatest names that have ever been worn by flesh and blood, including every one of those cited by Dr. Fuller himself.

We propose, however, to look at the commission itself. The particular part of it on which Baptists rely as excluding infants is the word "teach [*matheteusate,*]" which they say must be fulfilled before there can be any baptizing. Dr. Fuller says, "It is as plain as the sun in the firmament that *before* baptizing any one I am to teach him, and therefore that infants are not to be baptized." But Dr. Fuller's light on this point comes from some other sun than "the Sun of Righteousness." *Matheteusate* is a word which here, and nearly everywhere else in the New Testament, is used to denote the entire work of evangelization,—the whole office and end of the gospel in its practical effects upon individuals or nations. It is one of the largest and most comprehensive words used in the New Testament. It describes and includes the entire commission of all the ministers and Churches of Christ in this world. No preacher of the gospel, and no Church, has any thing more to do for Christ, from the day of Pentecost "to the end of the world," than that which is expressed in this one word *matheteusate.* And all the highest attainments of the best Christians, in knowledge, faith, obedience, and conformity to Christ, never once go beyond what is expressed in this word. The noblest and holiest of the apostles, in all their high qualities as Christians, were nothing more than *mathetai.* All that the apostles ever did in execution of the Savior's commands, and all that the Church has ever done or can do in these respects, is comprehended by this one term It is used more than two hundred and fifty times

in the New Testament; and, wherever it is used with reference to the Savior's commission, it is employed in this large and comprehensive sense. Hence, if the Baptist interpretation is correct, and the meaning of *matheteusate* must be fulfilled upon a man *before* he is to be baptized, there is no authority in the New Testament to baptize him at all. *The gospel has no commission which is not included in matheteusate.* This is a position which no man can overthrow. If there is any thing clear in the New Testament, it is this. And if people must be *mathetai* before we can proceed to baptize them, we have no right to baptize anybody; for no one is a Christian *mathetaes* before he is baptized.

This settles the point that there must be something wrong about the Baptist interpretation of this commission. In their zeal to exclude infants they necessarily exclude everybody else.

Again: the Baptist interpretation of the command makes it consist of three several things to be done, and that in a fixed order. First, that we are to make a man a *mathetaes*,—a true and full disciple of Christ; second, that after he has been made a disciple we are to baptize him; and, third, that after he has been made a disciple, and baptized in addition to his discipleship, we are next and finally to teach him Christ's commands. What nonsense! Dr. Fuller speaks of "this document as having been stretched on a Procustean bed, and, in derision of Scripture, amid the outcries of truth and grammar and common sense, violently mangled." Verily, it has been; and he is one of the

priests who officiated at the interesting ceremony. Let us examine the case.

1. *Upon the point of Scripture.* The Scriptures everywhere teach that a Christian *mathetaes*—one who has been made the subject of the command *matheteusate*—is one who is in all respects a follower of Christ,—one who is lacking in obedience to none of the ordinances or requirements of Christianity; not one who is only moved to become a Christian, but one who has already been made a Christian. (See the two hundred and fifty texts upon the subject.) It is, then, indeed a "derision of Scripture" to claim that one must first undergo all that is meant by *matheteusate* anterior to baptism. It is a direct contradiction of every passage in which the word *mathetaes* is found in the New Testament.

2. *Upon the "point of truth."* We suppose that Dr. Fuller holds his own formal propositions to be the truth. In the latter part of his book he devotes eight pages to show that "*baptism is a prerequisite to Church-membership.*" It was not necessary for him to be so learned upon this point, as no one denies it or ever has denied it. We agree entirely with it. But it is equally true that there is no Christian discipleship and no *mathetaes* where there is no Church-membership. Christ has no disciples but those who are in and constitute his Church, which is his body. Not all in the Church visible are really *mathetai;* but there are no *mathetai* outside of the Church. And if there is no Church-membership where there is no baptism, it is indeed "amid the outcries of truth" that men require us to be *mathetai* before we are baptized.

3. Upon the point *of grammar*. If Christ had meant this commission to enjoin three distinct items, each by itself standing in the same relation to the command as the other, the laws of grammar would require that each item should be enjoined in the same form if contained in the same sentence. Looking at the wording of the commission, we find it delivered in one imperative verb (*matheteusate*) and two participles, (*baptizontes* and *didaskontes*.) Dr. Fuller takes these three words as alike imperative, and as enjoining three distinct things. But we have the authority of Mr. Campbell that "the active participle always, when connected with the imperative mood, expresses the manner in which the thing commanded is to be performed. Cleanse the room,—washing it; clean the floor,—sweeping it; cultivate the field,—ploughing it; sustain the hungry,—feeding them; furnish the soldiers,—arming them; convert the nations,—baptizing them, are exactly the same forms of speech." (Christ. Bapt. p. 630.) This is all correct. The thing to be done is expressed by the imperative verb; and it is only the manner of the doing that is described in the connected participle. And so *matheteusate*—"disciple the nations"—describes the whole work to be done. This is the general imperative injunction, including all that follows; whilst the participles—*baptizontes* and *didaskontes*—only describe *the mode* or particular way in which the disciples are to be made. Every Greek grammarian will testify that this is the only true construction of the phraseology. *Matheteusate* presents the work to be accomplished, and the participles *baptizontes*

and *didaskontes* describe the way in which the great work enjoined is to be effected. In other words, we are to make disciples of all nations BY baptizing them and instructing them in the commands of Christ. This is the plain "grammar" of the case; and its "outcries" are mighty against the tortures inflicted by Baptist interpretation.

4. A word now on the point of "*common sense.*" If the theory of our recusants be correct, then a man must be a *mathetaes*—a disciple and follower of Christ—not only previous to baptism, *but even before he is instructed in the commands of Christ.* The instruction here is the last thing named. Baptism precedes it, and discipleship also. So that, to be consistent with Baptist interpretation, we must baptize the nations before we instruct them in Christianity, and make disciples of them before either teaching them or baptizing them!! Besides, if Christ meant that we should make disciples of people as a thing to be done before they are baptized and taught, then what is discipleship? How is it to be effected? In what does it consist? The Scriptures are silent. Common sense has no reply. Baptists are contending for a mere phantom of the imagination. And if they are honest, and mean to stick to their theory upon this "document," they must transmute Christianity itself into a piece of absurdity and nonsense. I know of nothing which more outrages "common sense."

Well, then, if *mathcteusate* is not to be taken separate from *baptizontes* and *didaskontes*, and does not set up a condition which is to precede both,—that is, if there can be no discipleship anterior to and

apart from the baptizing and the teaching,—it is settled and demonstrated forever that there is nothing in this commission to exclude infants from baptism. The very first thing here enjoined, in the way of executing the *matheteusate*, is to baptize in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and, along with, or following after, as the case may be, to teach the baptized to observe whatsoever things Jesus has commanded. This is the commission, according to the 28th of Matthew: nothing more and nothing less, as respects the point now under consideration. There is nothing in it to hinder the very first approach of Christianity to any child born in Christendom from being in the shape of the ordinance of baptism, to make it a learner in the School of Christ. So far as any terms of the command are concerned, our infant children have as much a place in it as in "*all nations*."

But Dr. Fuller, after all, does not appear to be entirely satisfied with his argument on "the only law Christ ever ordained on the subject." He must needs connect with it another and different passage, (Mark xvi. 15,) which contains not one single word of command on the subject of baptism. Mark tells us that, after the resurrection of the Savior, he said unto his chosen apostles, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." This is the commission, and the only commission, according to Mark. How any one should be able to extract from it a prohibition of the baptism of infants is a mystery. But Dr. Fuller has attempted it. He says that the "go preach" of Mark is the same as the *matheteusate*

of Matthew, and that the one explains the other. Very well: then the preaching of the gospel implies every thing that the ministers of Jesus have to do, in their official capacity, in this world; for *mathcteusate* includes the entire Christian commission, as we have shown. To preach the gospel, then, comprises also the administration of the sacraments; and this preaching of the gospel is to be "TO EVERY CREATURE." How, then, can infants be excluded?

Dr. Fuller says that preaching the gospel implies *teaching*. Very well: children may be taught, and must be taught; but neither in this passage, nor in all the Bible, is there any thing requiring that they must be taught before they dare be baptized. The commission, in its own terms, applies to "all nations" and "to every creature." Its substance is, the making of disciples, learners, followers, of Christ. The specific way to do it is by baptizing and teaching. The teaching may be before, along with, or after the baptism. Christ leaves all that open to the necessities of the case. In either event the commission is adequately fulfilled. If any stress is to be laid upon the order in which Christ has arranged the words of the command, *baptism comes first* and the *teaching* (*didaskontes*) afterward, as the subject is able to receive it. He who finds any thing in all this to exclude the children of believers must first interline the record. Christ's words do not contain it.

Much importance is sometimes laid upon the phrase in Mark, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This, Dr. Fuller thinks, "plainly requires,

1st. Teaching or preaching the gospel; 2d. Faith; 3d. Baptism;" and that this is the established divine order in every case. Now, if this be true, then no man can ever afterward be saved if perchance he should be baptized before he has really exercised true faith. Dr. Fuller places faith second, baptism third; accordingly, if baptism by any means comes before faith, the divine order is vitiated, the terms of salvation are not complied with, and heaven is lost. This is the natural and necessary implication of his interpretation. But the words of Christ specify no such order. Faith may come to maturity before or after baptism, and still be saving faith. "He that believeth and is *baptized*,—[whether before the exercise of personal faith or afterward,]—he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Who could ask any more room for the case of people baptized in infancy than is furnished in these very words? It is not said, He that believeth first, and afterward shall be baptized, shall be saved, but He that believeth and is—*whether already or hereafter*—baptized, shall be saved. Christ's words prescribe no order of essential antecedence or succession. Let the faith come first or last, only so that there is faith and baptism, there is salvation. This is God's covenant; and woe be to him who undertakes to alter or restrict it!

All expedients thus failing our immersionist friends, they next fix upon the word "*believeth*," as it here occurs in Mark's account, and insist that the commission limits baptism to such as do personally exercise faith prior to, or at the time of,

their baptism. Dr. Carson says, "I will risk the credit of my understanding on my success in showing that, *according to this commission, believers only are to be baptized.*" But better and greater men than Dr. Carson have risked the credit of their understandings upon the position that what Mark here says about faith and baptism permits the administration of baptism to infants as much as to any other class. So far from being a command to baptize only adult believers, these words are *no command at all.* They contain a simple announcement that all competent to receive the gospel with a personal faith must do so on pain of damnation. This no one disputes. Baptism by itself will save no man. "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved, and he that *believeth not* shall be damned," no matter whether he has been baptized or not. There must be personal faith in all capable of exercising it, or there can be no salvation. All are agreed upon this. But the question is, whether this personal faith must necessarily precede one's baptism. That question is not decided by these words, or by any other Scripture. Baptizing an infant does not incapacitate it to grow up a believer any more than leaving it unbaptized. And if it is *baptized,* and ever comes to the exercise of faith, it is saved as certainly and as effectually as any adult. He who denies this denies the word of the Lord Jesus. The promise is to it as much as to any other. How, then, is it excluded?

But, again: the Baptist argument that the gospel enjoins the baptism of believing converts, and that therefore none but believers are to be

baptized, has a very subtle sophistry underlying it, which needs to be exposed. It proceeds upon the assumption that infants are skeptics and infidels, —which is untrue.

We will not now suffer ourselves to be drawn into the metaphysical speculation as to whether a child can or cannot have faith. We know that faith has its degrees and phases, that salvation is accommodated to the necessities of all classes of mankind, that infancy and childhood are the periods of the highest bloom of a confiding disposition, that faith is the gift of God and not the product of human thought, understanding, feeling, or will, and that the administrations of the Holy Ghost are bound to no age or degree of intelligence, but extend as well to the infant just from its mother's womb as to the preacher on Zion's walls or the apostle amid the scenes of Pentecost. Dr. Fuller agrees that infants are *saved*, and refuses to have any thing to say to those who deny it. And certainly, if they are saved, they must be capable of receiving, and do receive, such experiences of God's methods of sanctification as to meet all the necessities of their tender age. It is also one of the common laws of humanity that our children are reckoned to follow their parents. If the parents are Jews, the children are Jews and stand in general relations with their parents. If the parents are citizens of the United States, their children are citizens of the United States by virtue of their connection with their parents. Though incompetent to the duties of citizenship in the full extent, still, constructively, they are citi-

zens, not aliens, not foreigners, not enemies. And this common law of nature holds in all our social relations. God hath set man in families; and this natural constitution is fully recognized in the economy of grace. The gospel treats with adults; but the relation of adults to it also includes and affects their infant children the same as in every other case. The infants of pious parents are from their very birth in the school of Christ and learners of him. Nor is it in the power of man to form an estimate as to the extent to which a devout and believing spirit in parents may be made to infuse itself into their children, or as to how far the discipleship of pious parents secures and includes discipleship in their infant offspring. It is certain that divine influences may be communicated and holy emotions awakened even before the child has learned the use of speech; and that, where parents will faithfully perform their part, their children will needs grow up disciples, with a mould of piety dating back in early infancy. By the necessities of their age and the relations in which God has placed them, their case must be construed with that of their parents. They are not infidels, not skeptics, not foreigners and strangers, but Christians,—constructive *believers*,—at least until they have grown to years of discretion and by their own deeds have placed themselves in a different attitude.

"What an idea!" exclaims Mr. Carson. "Might we not as well attempt to cure bedlam with syllogisms as reason with persons who speak of believing, militant infants? If any general should

talk of raising an army of infants to oppose an invading enemy, he would at once be deemed insane, and his sovereign would not one moment longer intrust him to command,—no, not though he were the Duke of Wellington. But, when doctors of divinity speak like madmen, it is only the depth of their theological learning; and they are only the more admired." (P. 217.) Dr. Fuller re-echoes his master in this "storm of hard words." Let us see, then, where this terrific charge of *bedlamism, madness, lunatic ravings,* falls, and with what sort of logic it is sustained.

In Jeremiah i. 5, God says to the youthful prophet, "Before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee." In Hosea xi. 1, the Lord saith, "When Israel was a child, then I loved him." In Luke i. 15, an angel declares of John that he should be "filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." Paul says to Timothy, (iii. 15,) "From a child [*apo brephous,—from an infant*] thou hast known the Holy Scriptures." And in Matt. xxi. 16, the Savior himself says, "Out of the mouths of *babes and sucklings* God has perfected praise," and, on another occasion, took little children in his arms and declared, "*Of such is the kingdom of heaven.*" If these are to be taken as the utterances of bedlam and the ravings of lunatics, we leave our Baptist friends to settle the matter with Him "who spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets." We prefer to see in them a divine interest and spiritual susceptibility in little children, especially as related to believing parents, which

forbid us to hold and treat them as aliens and blasphemers.

We also arraign, as unsound, unscriptural, and vicious, that principle which would exclude from a community all such as, if wholly made up of them, would not be competent to all its requisite functions. If such a rule were to be put in force, the Church, and the State, and humanity itself, would speedily be swept out of existence. It is contrary to all nature and to all the principles that govern in human things. Of course it would be insane to "talk of raising an army of infants to oppose an invading enemy." But would it be less insane for a community at war to turn over into the hands of the enemy all such as are incompetent to take the places of soldiers in the field? Because infants cannot occupy the trenches, are they therefore to be treated as aliens and enemies? What could be more absurd? And yet this, according to Mr. Carson's figure, is exactly what our Baptist friends are doing in refusing to admit our infants to be of the community of believers.

Let us compare the Baptist principle of argumentation with certain facts. Suppose that some statesman were to propose the organization of a congress or parliament of infants. "He would at once be deemed insane," says Mr. Carson. Why? Because infants have not the knowledge and experience for legislation. And yet it was deemed right and proper for the Prince of Wales to be acknowledged as a member of the British House of Lords from infancy; and from his birth or bap-

tism his name occupied the first place on the roll of that honorable house, without disadvantage to British interests or to the credit of the British Constitution. In the book of Numbers, iii. 28, we read of the family of the Kohathites, that to their males "*from a month old* and upward" was given the charge of keeping the sanctuary. "What!" Dr. Carson may say; "infants a month old keep God's sanctuary! Might we not as well attempt to cure bedlam with syllogisms as reason with persons who talk of infants keeping a charge?" Yet this was an arrangement of God himself, and recorded by the Holy Ghost for our learning. In Deuteronomy xxix. 10, Moses says to Israel, "Ye stand this day all of you before the Lord your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, YOUR LITTLE ONES, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water; *that thou shouldst enter into covenant with the Lord thy God, and into his oath*, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day." What! infants enter into covenant with God! Infants stand up to take an oath! Madness! madness! exclaim our Baptist friends. But either Moses was a lunatic, or the Holy Ghost a liar, or this very thing was done. Little children, even of the youngest age, were accounted parties to this great spiritual transaction, and that by authority of God. Let our recusants get around it if they can. Again: in 2 Chron. xx. we read, that when Ammon, Moab, and the dwellers in Mount Seir marched their combined forces against Jehosha-

phat, "All Judah stood before the Lord, WITH THEIR LITTLE ONES, their wives, AND THEIR CHILDREN;" and their united supplication was, "O our God, wilt thou not judge them? for we have no might against this company: . . . but our eyes are upon thee." Here are infants and children reckoned as taking part in a great public supplication and engaged in the work of opposing an enemy. How could this be said of babes? Yet God does say it of an entire community, in which babes are specified as doing what their parents did. They were reckoned with the people with whom they were domestically related; and this is the common custom of the inspired writers.

We submit here the question put by Dr. Rice:— "*When did God ever enter into covenant with parents without including their infant children?* Is there a solitary example of the kind in the Bible?" Not one. The covenant with Abraham included the youngest children. The covenant of Moses did the same. And when Peter, "full of the Holy Ghost," came to expound the new covenant on the day of Pentecost, he said to all who yielded to his words, "*The promise is to you* AND TO YOUR CHILDREN." (Acts ii. 39.)

This ought to settle the point that children are not to be viewed as aliens and infidels, but that they follow, as infants, the condition and relations of their parents; and that, if domestically related to believers, they are to be reckoned as believers and to be treated in some sense as such. All this hue and cry, then, about baptizing unbelievers—as if we were baptizing skeptics and infidels when

we baptize infants—is without foundation and contrary to the letter and the whole spirit of the Scriptures.

Then again: the rigid interpretation insisted on by Baptists, that the commission allows the baptizing of none but such as actually, truly, and personally believe, involves other embarrassments. If we are to baptize believers only, how can we baptize anybody? Do Baptists fulfill their interpretation of the commission? We aver that they do not. They themselves must admit, and have admitted, that they do not. Campbell sadly tells us that *not one-tenth part* of those immersed by him and his associates can enter the kingdom of heaven. Why? Because their after-lives have shown that they had no real faith. Then, *in nine cases out of ten*, according to his own doctrine and concessions, his baptisms are but violations of Christ's commands and a profanation of God's holy sacrament. Nine times out of ten his efforts to keep his interpretation of the commission have failed. And every one who attempts it must fail. The apostles and inspired preachers at the beginning of the Christian Church failed. They baptized Simon Magus, and it afterward turned out that he had neither part nor lot in the matter. They baptized Ananias and Sapphira, and others who afterward showed that they had no faith. Then, if Baptist interpretation is to stand, they were mere violators of their Lord's command, with all their inspiration! Man cannot see the heart; he cannot know what is in his brother. He may think he has credible evidence of faith

or of a hopeful approach to it; and on that ground the Baptist proceeds to baptize. We do not say that he is wrong in this. It is all that we can ask. It is all that Christ meant that we should require. But we declare and hold that we have every whit as much ground to believe and hope that the children of believers will grow up pious as that upon which the Baptist proceeds with his "*believer's baptism*," as he, with a flourish, calls it.

Dr. Baker says, "Some years since, the assertion having been made that the children of the pious were no better than others, an investigation was made; and, the families within a certain district having been divided into three classes,—those in which both parents were professedly pious, those in which only one parent was a professor, and those in which neither parent made any pretensions to religion,—it was ascertained that of the children over ten years of age, in the first class, *two-thirds* were hopefully pious; and, in the second class, about *one-third*." (Sermons, 1st ser. p. 204.) It is also asserted with confidence, of a Pedobaptist denomination famous for its spirituality and missionary fervor, that "not one of ten of its members can remember the period when he began to be pious,"—an indication most gratifying as to the proportion of pious among the children of their members. Nay, God himself says, "Train up a child in the way he should go, *and when he is old he will not depart from it*." (Prov. xxii. 6.) All that is necessary, then, for an infant to make it the child of God is to train it right. If parents will only "bring it up in the nurture and admoni-

tion of the Lord," its spiritual character is vouched for by God himself. And this they are required to profess and promise before we can baptize their children. Profession and promise is all that Baptists deem necessary. So that, all taken together, we have full as much ground to hope that we are conferring baptism upon believers only when we thus baptize our babes, as Baptists have for their vaunted "believer's baptism." Taking their own view of the commission in this particular, we challenge them to the proof that we come any further short of it than they themselves.

But there is another and more serious aspect of the Baptist argument on the commission, which shows that they do most sadly wrest God's holy word. If this quotation from Mark excludes infants from baptism, it at the same time, and with the same force, excludes them from salvation and makes "another gospel" necessary to bring them to heaven. If they dare not be baptized because they do not exercise personal faith, then, according to the same record, they must be damned for the same reason. If this commission serves to prohibit their baptism, it must serve also to damn them if they should die before arriving at years of discretion. The only way in which Baptists can escape the monstrous conclusion to which their logic on this passage drives them is to provide a different gospel for children than for men. After what Paul has said upon the subject of "another gospel," we would hardly suppose it possible for any one to think seriously of such a thing. "Though we, or an angel from heaven,"

says he, "preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, *let him be accursed.*" (Gal. i. 8, 9.) And yet the logic of our Baptist friends has driven them to admit "another gospel" as necessary to keep departed babes out of hell! Hear them.

Mr. Ewing, on Mark xvi. 16, says, "From this text some infer that a person must actually believe, else he cannot be baptized. With as much reason they might infer that a person must actually believe, else he cannot be saved." To this the most learned Baptist critic replies, "*Certainly: if there were no way of saving children but by the gospel, this conclusion would be inevitable. The gospel saves none but by faith. The gospel has nothing to do with infants.* BY THE GOSPEL NO INFANT CAN BE SAVED. Infants who enter heaven must be regenerated, but not by the gospel. The man who would preach infant salvation out of the apostolic commission, *or attempt to prove that the commission* MAY BE EXPLAINED SO AS TO INCLUDE IT, I SHOULD GAINSAY, on the same ground on which I resist the attempts to include in it infant baptism." (P. 173.) "Infants are not saved by the new covenant, and therefore cannot be connected with it in any view which represents them as interested in it. It is a vulgar mistake of theologians to consider that if infants are saved they must be saved by the new covenant. . . . *Were it true that infants could not be saved but by this covenant, none of them would be saved.*" (Pp. 215, 216.) Dr. Fuller takes the same ground,—as all consistent with the Baptist interpretation must,—that "*In-*

fants are neither saved nor baptized under the commission." (P. 116.) The adoption of the one position carries with it the other. If infants cannot be baptized under this commission, they cannot be saved under it. Then how are they saved? The answer from the Baptist champions is, "*By another covenant*,—BY ANOTHER GOSPEL." There is no other alternative. And, as there is no other gospel, and cannot be another, the Baptist reasoning on this point at once cuts off salvation from our dying babes, and writes upon every infant's tomb, "LOST!—LOST!—LOST!" What, then, becomes of the Savior's precious words?—"Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; *for of such is the kingdom of heaven.*" Alas! alas! their meaning is gone, and our little ones whom we committed to the ground "are perished."

One of three things, therefore, must be true. First, infants are reached by the commission, and may and ought to be baptized, so far as they are thereby being put into the position of learners in Christ; or, second, there must be another and different gospel for them than for adults; or, third, all who die in infancy are forever lost. The reader is to judge which is the most agreeable to reason, Scripture, and common sense. We have no fears as to the result of an unbiased judgment in the case. The great and only argument which Baptists have produced against the baptizing of infants drops asunder like flax at the touch of flame. It quite dissolves before an intelligent examination of the truth. The charge of "damnable heresy" rebounds upon the heads of those who make it.

CHAPTER XXIII.

THE RELATIONS OF INFANTS TO THE KINGDOM—AN ARGUMENT FOR THEIR BAPTISM.

We think it has now been shown that there is nothing in the commission which Christ has given to his Church, which, by any tenable system of interpretation, can be made to exclude the infants of believers from baptism. And if the commission does not *exclude* them it *includes* them; and it is Christ's will that they should be baptized. This ought to be enough to satisfy any one not hopelessly committed to a sectarian cause. It quite disposes of the only show of argument which our Baptist friends, in all their zeal, have been able to present. But we propose now to present the cause of infant baptism in much deeper relations than those of the mere naked letter of Scripture, and to show that it is seated in the very heart and life of Christianity.

There is such a thing as a kingdom of grace,—a plan or economy of divine operations by which God has been moving since the foundation of the world to redeem and renew poor fallen humanity. This kingdom is the centre and controlling principle of all providence, all history, and all Scripture. It began with the gracious purposes and promises

of God, and is to reach its consummation in the ultimate completion, glory, and rest of the Church in the heavenly state. It is a grand and wonderful administration, which centres in and goes out from Christ in his character of Mediator between God and an apostate world. It also comprehends all of the human race, of every age and of every class, who are recovered from the fall, made the sons of God by adopting love, or in any way brought from the ruins of sin to the joys and honors of ultimate salvation. These are sublime propositions, which compass the whole spirit, aim, and meaning of Providence and revelation. They present the sum of all God's merciful dealings with our world. No man can deny them and be a Christian.

Now, it is equally clear that this divine and blessed economy has a visible, tangible, and outward existence in our world. It stands connected with external manifestations, signs, agencies, and administrations, which, in the aggregate, we are accustomed to call THE CHURCH. These external signs and forms have not always been exactly the same. God has varied them to suit the condition of humanity in its different eras of growth and spiritual development. Dispensations change, but it is ever the same gracious kingdom and the same glorious Church; just as a nation or empire may modify its laws or change its administrations and yet remain the same body-politic. God has but one Church, one remedial kingdom, from the beginning on forever.

I. We lay it down, then, as a plain and obvious truth, that, if God has such a kingdom, and has connected it with certain outward ritual signs, all who are savingly reached by it or are members of it, unless excluded by specific law, must be equally entitled to those ritual signs, and no man has any right to withhold them. The man in all respects a citizen of our country is entitled to every thing in which citizenship is signified or expressed, except where there is specific law disabling him as to some of the superior offices. This is a clear principle, recognized and approved in all society, and which must hold good in the kingdom of God as well as in the states of earth. To allow one to be altogether a child of grace and a participant in the immunities of redemption, and yet to deny to it the signals and badges and tokens of its accepted estate, is a piece of gross injustice and absurdity. It is to affirm and deny at the same time. It is a proceeding which all right reason and common sense must at once condemn.

II. We furthermore affirm, and hold ourselves in readiness to prove, that our infants are as completely reached and embraced by the remedial kingdom as any adults, so that if they should die in infancy they are as truly among the saved as those who leave the world after the longest lives of saintship. We suppose that Baptists and Christians generally will readily admit this. Dr. Fuller says, "Our Pedobaptist brethren and ourselves have no controversy about the *salvation* of infants.

If any man believes that infants, with or without water, will be damned, I have nothing to say to that man." (P. 108.) Three evangelists have told us that our Savior took up little, young, infant children in his arms and said, "OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN;" that is, the kingdom of God is made up of them and all like them. Some have undertaken to say that this declaration of the Lord does not include children, but refers only to such as are *like* them. But, if this passage does not include children, heaven does not include them. There can be no salvation apart from the kingdom of God and heaven. And if this saying does not put our babes in the kingdom of God, it inevitably puts them in hell. There is no other alternative. Infants, therefore, are included in the remedial kingdom, or they are not included in the hopes and promises of heaven, and those of them "which are fallen asleep are perished."

III. It is also a scriptural truth, not to be disputed, that, under the dispensation now in force, baptism is the divinely appointed token and sacrament of Christian discipleship,—the solemn rite in which the remedial kingdom comes to men and men come into visible relationship with the kingdom of God. It is the great christening ordinance, without which no one can be regarded as truly a Christian. Jesus has said, Make disciples of the nations, "*baptizing them.*" There is, then, no complete discipleship, no proper relation to the divine kingdom, where there is no baptism. It is by baptism that the Savior himself was *Christed*,

anointed, and visibly installed into the great office of mediatorship. He performed not one single function of his mediatorial office until he was baptized. It was by that service that he was officially made *the Christ;* and it is by the same sort of service that those who are his become officially identified with his Christhood and participants in the saving benefits of his administrations. This is God's law upon the subject. Whosoever, then, is unfit for baptism, is unfit for salvation, unfit to be a partaker of his renewing and sanctifying mercies. Disqualification for baptism is disqualification for the kingdom; for baptism is the sign and sacrament of saving relation to that kingdom.

Baptists greatly mistake the nature and design of this ordinance when they present it as the mere act of a believing man, by which he evinces his obedience and joins himself to the visible Church. Baptism is an act which goes out from Christ,—a divine motion toward the sinner. Jesus says, "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you." All faith has something underlying it which is altogether of God. Salvation comes to us first; and if any man is a believer it is because God first came to him and enabled him to believe. Faith is built upon something anterior to itself. It is the mere yielding and bending of the soul to the movings of divine grace toward it. The kingdom must come to us before we can come to the kingdom. And what baptism signifies is not so much our yielding or believing, as God's saving grace availing for our souls. It is the token of divine favor and blessing,—the sign of what God

does, rather than what we do. Now, if no man resisted the movings of divine grace which underlie all faith, no man would fail of salvation. So long as there is not positive unbelief and disobedience, grace savingly applies. It is in this way that salvation comes to the infant world. And, wherever redeeming grace avails, baptism is the appointed token, and signal, and seal of the fact. It is a sort of magna charta from God, outwardly signifying, conferring, guaranteeing, and sealing the rights, immunities, and blessings of his remedial kingdom to all entitled to them. This is a grant which must come anterior to faith. It is upon this that faith is built. It is a grant which looks to the awakening of faith and acceptance on our part. Unbelief and disobedience may reject the grant and vitiate the covenant; but, until there is positive unbelief and rejection of the offered grace of the gospel, that grant or covenant is effective and holds good unto salvation.

IV. Now, then, as children are reached by God's saving grace and are real participants in the blessings of the remedial kingdom, and as baptism is at least the outward token of the motions and applications of that saving grace, without a specific warrant from God himself, to deny baptism to children, is either to deny children a place in the divine kingdom, or to disconnect baptism from that from which alone it derives its significance and life and to which God himself has joined it. In either case we contradict plain Scripture and fact. So that from the deepest

heart and life of Christianity we are called upon to baptize infants as well as adults.

We will endeavor to present this thought in other forms. Baptism is the sacrament of regeneration; that is, it is a visible rite which God has connected with the saving operations of his grace in Christ Jesus. It is an outward sign coupled with an invisible grace. Where the invisible grace is, there this sign belongs. Infants are partakers of this invisible grace: "*of such is the kingdom.*" They are among the saved by the remedial scheme set forth in Christ Jesus. To them, therefore, belongs also the sign which God has instituted to accompany this invisible grace. If they are incompetent to receive the outward sign, they are still more incompetent to receive the invisible and saving mercy signified; and so, if they are not fit to be baptized, they are incapable of salvation, and, dying in childhood, must be lost.

Baptists agree that infants must be regenerated in order to enter heaven,—that they must become subjects of the saving efficacy of the remedial kingdom. Dr. Carson says, "Infants who enter heaven must be regenerated. . . . Infants must be sanctified." (P. 173.) Why, then, deny them the sacrament of regeneration,—the token which marks and indicates that sanctification? If they have the thing, we have no right to withhold God's appointed sign or seal of that thing.

Every informed Christian will admit that the mediatorial constitution is not to be bounded in its capacity or force by any merely chronological

or geographical lines in the history of the race, allowing it to be efficacious only for the people of this or that country or this or that period. Such a thought would be exceedingly repugnant to every Christian sense and feeling. But it certainly is no less offensive and abhorrent to limit or bound the force of this salvation by a line sundering infancy and childhood from riper age, and to make it of real effect on one side of this line only and not on the other. Humanity is not merely our mature life, but all the stages through which we reach maturity. It includes infancy and childhood as a necessary part of its constitution. A large proportion of it exists always under this form; and nearly one-half of it is cut off by death before it reaches maturity. Now, the question is not simply, Can such infants be saved if they should happen to die? but, Is there no real room for them, living or dying, in the concrete mystery of the new creation, in the communion of Christ's mediatorial life, in the efficacy of God's remedial kingdom, in the bosom of the one holy, catholic Church? Does the nature of the second Adam and of the regenerative scheme going out from him take in and reach only one-half of humanity while it wholly excludes the other? Such an imagination is worse than foolish. It would take from Christ his claim to be a universal Savior, and from redemption its commensurateness with the fall. Christ must be coextensive in his kingdom with universal humanity from infancy to old age as well as with its mere numerical expansion. Paul teaches us that the second Adam, in

his saving power, is more than commensurate with the ruin of the first. (Rom. v. 12–21.) And, as infants were embraced by the law of sin and death, it demands the most solid proofs to show that they are shut out from the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus. No one is prepared to deny the capability of infants for salvation; and no one is prepared to show that infants are not partakers of the common corruption which has resulted from the fall. Christianity, then, must have a place for them. The remedial kingdom must reach them. Saving grace must somehow avail for them. And, as Christ and heaven stretch out their arms to our babes and say, "*Let them come: of such is the kingdom,*" nothing short of an express and pointed "thus saith the Lord" will warrant any man to rise up and say that the sign and seal of such gracious relations does not belong to them.

Infants are a part of Christ's mystical body. They are an integral portion of that humanity for which his mediation avails. They are redeemed by his blood. They are among the purchases of his death. Until they, by unbelief and disobedience, reject him, they are his. Redemption is efficacious for them. The kingdom of God is of them and others like them. If this is not true, there is no hope for them. Just as surely, then, as God has linked baptism to the effectual application of saving grace, to signify and seal it, and just as certainly as it is Christ's appointed badge for those who are partakers of his healing and saving life-power, it is to be administered to

infants, and the deepest and most vital constitution of Christianity is touched and violated by excluding them from it. Indeed, to us there seems to be but this one alternative,—that infants are entitled to baptism, or else they must perish; —not that baptism alone can save them, but for the reason that any thing which incapacitates them for baptism must at the same time incapacitate them for salvation. As has been remarked by an able Review, "If children may not be baptized, they cannot in any way be gathered into the bosom of the Church. Then it cannot be said that Christ has room for them at present in his arms. His grace may have regard to them prospectively; but where they are just now, by the fearful disabilities of childhood, it cannot reach them or touch them in the way of help. Their only hope is in the uncovenanted mercies of God and his power at pleasure to save *without Christ.* They are disqualified constitutionally for *Christian* salvation. On Baptist premises we see no escape from this conclusion."

It may be said, however, that this is too roundabout and inferential a way to find authority for infant baptism. But Dr. Carson agrees that a solid and legitimate inference following from clear and expressed scriptural principles is just as authoritative as the explicit words of inspiration. Nay, this perpetual harping upon the mere letter of the law, which insists that a case is not provided for unless set forth in express terms, as remarked in the Review above quoted, "is a monstrous falsehood, as well as a miserable Jewish

pedantry. Christianity has a life and constitution of its own, in the bosom of which only, and by the power of which alone, the true sense of the Bible can be fairly understood; and in this view it is that the practice of infant baptism by the universal Church from the beginning comes to its full significance and weight. We not only infer it from the authority of express precept and example going before, in the age of the apostles, but we see in it also the very soul and spirit of Christianity itself, actualizing and expounding in a living way the sense of its own word. If it could be clearly made out that the household baptisms of the New Testament included no infants,—nay, if it were certain that the Church had no apostolical rule whatever in the case, but had gradually settled here into her own rule,—we should hold this still to be of truly divine authority, and the baptism of infants of necessary Christian obligation, as the only proper sense and meaning of the New Testament institution interpreted thus to its full depth by the Christian life itself."

V. But we propose to bring the matter a step nearer. We have argued, and, we think, conclusively, that, as the remedial kingdom avails for infants, and as baptism is the appointed token or sign which is to accompany such effectual relation to Christ and his saving grace, infants are to be baptized. We will now undertake to show that up to the Christian "reformation," by express

authority of God, the token or sign of his gracious covenant was administered to infants.

Dr. Fuller says, "It is monstrous to go into the Old Testament to see who are to be baptized." But how does it happen that he saw nothing monstrous in going back to the old *heathen* to find out what baptism is? If Jewish ablutions and heathen classics are to be consulted to ascertain *the mode* of baptism, it certainly is quite legitimate to consult the old divine law of Church-membership to find out the proper *subjects*. And why not go back to the Old Testament? Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning. The Old Testament was God's kingdom just as really and truly as the New. It is one and the same olive-tree, from which the Jews were broken off and the Gentiles grafted in. (See Romans xi. 6–24.) Whatever ceremonial changes and constitutional modifications may have been made by the Christian "reformation," the spiritual corporation was the same. The prophets are the brethren of the apostles. The true member of the Jewish or patriarchal Church is a part of the same household in which the true Christian is found. The New is only a further completion of the Old. And if we can find an ancient law of God ordaining infant membership, it must be shown that that law has been authoritatively repealed or changed, or it still remains to be observed,—at least, as to its spirit.

The first form of the kingdom of God among men was the patriarchal, which extended from Adam to Abraham. Under that system *the family*

was the Church and the father the priest. God then had no visible kingdom but that which existed in the domestic constitution. It was only in the household economy, and in what appertained to its healthful and vigorous condition, that men came into visible relations to the divine kingdom in those days. It was God's own arrangement. That it included children is infallibly certain; otherwise the race itself must have ceased. Here, then, we have children in the Church, and as much connected with the kingdom of God as their grown brothers or their fathers, *for more than two thousand years.*

The next form of the divine kingdom was that which held from the calling of Abraham to Moses. This connected the visible Church with a particular race of people, the outward mark of which was circumcision. All Abraham's descendants in the line of Isaac and Jacob, and all others who became permanently identified with that race, having received the rite of circumcision, constituted God's visible kingdom, than which he had in that period no other kingdom among men. Did it include infants? Read Genesis xvii.:—"And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy seed after thee: every man-child among you shall be circumcised; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And *he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you.*"

Here, then, is a divine law, appointing the cir-

cumcision of infants as parties to God's gracious covenant and as members in his Church as it then existed. This same law was continued through the Mosaic economy down to the time of Christ himself. From the very beginning of the world, therefore, God has admitted children to his visible kingdom, and appointed that they should receive the signs and tokens of the same. Let Baptists show us when and where there has ever been an abrogation of the spirit of these regulations, and we will submit without another word. If this law for the recognition of infant membership has ever been annulled, the record of it can be found, and may be produced. But, until that record is produced, we are bound to receive it as God's own positive law that our infant children are not to be denied the token of his covenant.

To escape the force of this argument, at once so clear and satisfactory, Dr. Fuller suggests that "circumcision was no seal of spiritual blessings," and that it referred to mere temporal immunities. In this he differs from the holy Apostle Paul. We would think "the righteousness which is of faith" a spiritual blessing; and Paul says that Abraham "received the sign of *circumcision*, A SEAL OF THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF FAITH." (Rom. iii. 11.) We would also think God's engagement to be a God to him, and to his seed after him, involved something of spiritual blessings; but in that very covenant circumcision is explicitly appointed and ordained as its token and seal. Dr. Carson is constrained to admit that "circumcision and baptism correspond in meaning," and that "*both relate to the*

removal of sin, the one by cutting, the other by washing." (P. 229.) Is the removal of sin no spiritual blessing? Nay, if there was no spiritual blessing connected with the covenant of which circumcision was the token, there was nothing spiritual in the Old Testament, or in the only kingdom which God had upon earth up to the time when "the Word was made flesh." So extraordinary and "monstrous" a doctrine cannot be entertained for one moment. It is a desperate resort to exclude children from the Church.

But our Baptist doctors argue that the circumcision of Jewish children could have had no reference to spiritual blessings, or to any relation to the kingdom of God, because "infants cannot have faith." They must then assume that infants are infidels, and that they dare not be reckoned with the Church-community,—which we have shown to be contrary to all reason and Scripture-facts. Nay, to deny the capacity of our infants to receive spiritual blessings or to stand in full connection with the divine kingdom, is not only to "gainsay an angel from heaven," but to gainsay the Son of God himself. We read in the Gospels that "little children," "young children," "*brephæ*—NEW-BORN BABES"—were brought to him, that he should put his hands on them and pray; and his disciples rebuked them. Perhaps they thought with our Baptist friends that "the gospel has nothing to do with infants." But the Savior was "*much displeased*" at their conduct, and said, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me:" Why? *Because* "*of* SUCH IS THE KINGDOM OF

HEAVEN." (Matt. xix. 13, 14.) Now, let men argue as they please, and adopt what principles of interpretation may suit them best, and sneer at the incapacities of children as the necessities of their creed may require: the Son of God here assigns to infants an interest in his gospel and a relation to his kingdom as real, close, and effective as can be claimed for any adult, whether on earth or in heaven. "OF SUCH IS THE KINGDOM." There it stands, written of God, clear as the light, firm as the world, true as the heart of Jesus. With such relations to the kingdom and covenant, circumcision in the case of infants must take a meaning quite as deep and spiritual as that allowed to it in the case of Abraham himself.

We will not pursue our Baptist friends into their labyrinthine disquisitions upon *covenants*. We will simply remark, that if the covenant of which circumcision was the token was in no way a spiritual covenant, and did not embrace the Church, we challenge and defy our recusants to find and show any visible Church on earth anterior to the Savior's advent; and that the formal renewal of that covenant in the 29th of Deuteronomy demonstrates its spiritual character, including Israel's "LITTLE ONES" along with their parents as parties to the high and solemn engagements.

Thus, then, from the foundation of the world until the institution of Christianity, the uniform and positive law of God was that infants stood in the same relation to the kingdom and covenant of God with their parents, and that the sign and token of the same was to be given to them as early

as the eighth day after their birth. We have found the law putting infants in the Church and connecting them visibly and sacramentally with the divine kingdom. It now devolves upon our opponents to find the law which puts them out. If they cannot produce such a law, we are certainly bound in all reason and conscience to consider them as sustaining the same relations to the kingdom and its visible token under the Christian economy which God himself gave them in all the dispensations preceding it.

VI. Nay, we go still further. We will produce a passage from the lips of Jesus, which shows that, under the gospel, there is such a thing as the reception of the kingdom on the part of little children. We read in Mark x. 13–15, "They brought young children unto him, and his disciples rebuked them that brought them. But when Jesus saw it he was much displeased, and said unto them, *Suffer the little children to come unto me*, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God. *Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not* RECEIVE THE KINGDOM OF GOD AS A LITTLE CHILD, *he shall not enter therein.*"

We observe, then, that infants may come to Christ. He himself says, *let them come.* It is therefore possible for them to come.

It is useless for Baptists to suggest philosophical objections. Christ says it; and his words are not to be revised and amended by the philosophies of ignorant and erring men. *There is such a thing as the coming of babes to Jesus.* This is "a nail in a

sure place," which must hold even to the day of doom. "That children are capable of being brought to Christ and blessed by him is clearly established by this passage," says Mr. Carson himself. And so Alexander Campbell:—"Whatever the character of these little children may have been, *they came to him.*" We will not press the fact that the phrase *coming to Christ* signifies whatever is implied in becoming a Christian; and so baptism also. If this is the meaning to be attached to it in this place, our case is made out,—that infants are capable of discipleship, and are therefore to be christened by baptism. But if this is not to be taken as its import in this connection, it must still express a relation to and an interest in Christ which must needs identify them with the Church, and so entitle them to the sign and seal of such relationship.

But the point which we desire more particularly to present is in the latter part of this remarkable text. Three things are here asserted: first, that infants are receivers of the kingdom of God; second, that they so completely receive the kingdom of God as to be models for all receivers of it; and, third, that adults must receive it just the same as little children, or they never can enter into it. "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God AS A LITTLE CHILD [receives it], he shall not enter therein. . . . Except ye be converted and become AS LITTLE CHILDREN, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."

How, then, do little children receive the kingdom of God? That they do receive it, the Son of

God is witness. How do they receive it? Can any one be said to receive the kingdom of God under the gospel without at the same time being a proper subject for baptism? Nay, further: can any one receive the kingdom of God at all, in any visible and tangible respect, without being baptized? As the Church was constituted under the old dispensation, the reception of the kingdom and promise was linked to circumcision; and no male infant could, in strict language, be said to have received the kingdom until circumcision was performed. The reception of the kingdom now is just as intimately linked with baptism. "Except a man be born OF WATER AND *of the Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," are Christ's own words. In the certain fact, then, attested as it is by the Son of God, that infants under the gospel are receivers of the kingdom, and, as such, the models of all effectual receptions of the kingdom, their baptism is necessarily implied.

VII. Nay, more: the presentations made in pointing to children in their reception of the kingdom *as the models* according to which alone the kingdom can be effectually received carry with them this certain implication:—that, UNLESS EVERY BAPTISM IS ESSENTIALLY AN INFANT BAPTISM, IT IS NO AVAILING BAPTISM AT ALL. The kingdom must be received as little children receive it; the man must be converted and become *as a little child*, or the kingdom of God is not for him. Dr. Carson himself admits that "every believer must be as a

little child." All unregenerated adults must undo their whole lives, and return again to infancy to start afresh on the same level with babes, to the same absence of unbelief, unteachableness, and disobedience with which an infant is brought to the font, or there can be no availing baptism and no salvation.

Let the reader weigh these thoughts; let him consider how the Lord of the Church here requires all baptisms to be essentially infant baptisms; let him grasp what is implied in a right reception of the kingdom of God, the model of which Christ himself finds in little children; and how he can rid himself of the conclusion that our infants are proper subjects of Christian baptism we are at a loss to see. Shall the lips of Infinite Wisdom pronounce them possessed of all that is demanded in a proper reception of the kingdom on the part of adults, and yet we reject them as unfit to receive the kingdom themselves? Shall Jesus press them to his loving heart, declaring that "*of such* is the kingdom of God," and we refuse to them his own appointed sign of acceptance and token of his saving mercy? Shall the Son of God bid them welcome to his arms and blessing as his choicest jewels, and the eternal heavens stand open to admit them, and we undertake to say that they are unfit to be rated even with his weakest and frailest disciples? Before we will give consent to a system so discordant with the words and heart of the blessed Savior, let this right hand forget her cunning, and this tongue cleave to the roof of the mouth which contains it!

Now, honestly and candidly taking together this whole subject of the relation of our babes to the remedial kingdom, its signs and tokens under former dispensations, and the positive declarations of its King with children in his arms, we regard it as impossible to doubt the divinity of infant baptism, or to question the propriety of the common Church-practice, from the beginning until now, of administering this holy sacrament to all who can justly be regarded as in the position of learners in Jesus, including our babes as well as all who by repentance and conversion become like them.

CHAPTER XXIV.

INFANT BAPTISM PRACTICED BY THE APOSTLES.

We have now shown that infant baptism is no sin; that it is not prohibited by the commission; and that the relation of our children to the kingdom of God implies and demands it. Certainly, if infants are to be numbered with Christ's redeemed, and are so far the subjects of gospel grace as to be saved, and are possessed of qualities rendering them in the Savior's eyes the very *models* of what disciples of Christ must be, they are to be rated among those who are to receive the marks, signs, and acknowledgments of discipleship, and are to be baptized. In all the length and breadth of the inspired volume there is not

one syllable, in the form of command, precept, explanation, caution, or example, to prevent the solemn charge to make disciples of all nations, from extending to little *babes* as well as to men in the maturity of life. And when we consider that this charge was given to *Jews*, with whom it was a divinely appointed thing in religious matters to extend to children the same rites and ordinances enjoyed by themselves,—that it was delivered to those very men whom its Author rebuked in so much displeasure when in a mistaken zeal they sought to prevent children from being brought to him,—and that he had in the most explicit and impressive manner previously referred to little children as model subjects of his kingdom,—the evidence is perfectly conclusive that when he said "*all nations*" he meant what he said, and that it is his will that all the constituents of a nation that can by any means be made learners in him should be regarded as rightful subjects of baptism. So that it is not without solid foundation that the distinguished Danish Dr. Martinsen has said, "The more infant baptism prevails in the world, the more are the words of the Lord fulfilled, that *the nations* should be made disciples by baptism and instruction."

But, if all this does not satisfy the reader that infants are among the proper subjects of baptism, we have another and more direct sort of argument, which will admit of no evasion.

All must agree that the inspired apostles understood the scope and nature of the great commission which the ascending Savior delivered to them,

and that their practice under that command must be taken as a conclusive and final explanation of what the Savior meant. If they baptized children, we are bound to conclude that Christ meant that children should be baptized, and that we also ought to see to it that their baptism be not neglected.

The question, then, arises, DID THE APOSTLES BAPTIZE LITTLE CHILDREN? As we expect to be judged by the all-knowing God, we believe that they did, and will now proceed to give what we regard as conclusive evidence of the fact.

I. There is not a single instance in all the New Testament in which any one who had grown up from childhood as a member of a Christian household was ever baptized in adult life. Upon this point we will give the substance of Professor Wilson's acute observations. Baptists affirm that there is no instance of infant baptism furnished in Scripture. We shall examine that matter more at length presently. What we propose here to insist on is, that *no adult baptism*, in the sense in which it is repudiated by us and maintained as a distinctive tenet by our recusants, *can be shown in the word of God.*

Let us not be misunderstood. The terms *adult baptism* are used with two different applications; one denoting the ordinance as administered to a Christian convert from another faith or a heathen condition, the other embracing only the case of children who have grown up under Christian training but are denied baptism except in case of

a personal profession of faith in Christ. Now, as to the baptism of a convert from the Jewish religion, or from heathenism, or from the uninstructed and ungodly world, there is no difference between us and Baptists. We all contend that such a one must be baptized. It presents no distinctive feature of the Baptist system any more than of ours. It is therefore to be cancelled, as a common quantity, arguing nothing on either side. As to those scriptural instances on which Baptists lean so confidently for an exclusively adult baptism, we are prepared to show that, without a single exception, they were administered to converts from Judaism or idolatry. They present the common ground which we hold alike with our Baptist friends. What we affirm, then, is, that apart from these there is not a solitary example of adult baptism in the New Testament. If there be such an instance, the industry of Baptists can produce it. We challenge them to do so. And until they do so, they remain in the unenviable position of making that a distinctive feature of Christianity which puts the children of Christian parentage and training on a level with Pharisees, idolaters, and worldlings, and deals with them in a way which has no parallel in the word of God, or in all the transactions of his inspired servants.

Now, the utter silence of the Scriptures as to any adult baptisms of such as have grown up in the Church under all the influences of Christianity from early childhood, is a matter of no small importance. It is useless for Baptists to say that the period of Scripture history is too

short to produce such instances. It extends over from five to thirty years. If this was not time enough to produce them, they must be of very slow growth. If it was the custom of the apostolic age to withhold baptism from the infant children of the multitudes of converts, and to let those children grow up sustaining the same relation to the Church as the heathen, it must be regarded as very remarkable and unaccountable that not one instance can be found of the baptism of any of this large and interesting class in after-life. Either *there were such* adult baptisms or *there were not.* If there were, then the mere silence of Scripture is not to be held as disproving their existence, any more than the mere silence of Scripture could disprove the existence of infant baptism. But if there were no such cases, then the children in question must have been either baptized in infancy or altogether exempted from submission to the ordinance. We are reluctant in any case to rest an affirmative on the mere silence of a document; and yet the Baptist can show no better foundation for this distinctive feature of his system. With respect to infants, we do not undertake to stand upon such ground. We claim that the Scriptures do speak upon the subject, pointedly and clearly; but, as to the adult baptism of the children of believers, *there is not a case of it in all the records of apostolic history.* Baptists themselves have been forced to acknowledge this. "I admit," says Rev. Baptist Noel, "that there are no instances recorded in the New Testament where the persons baptized are said to

be the children of believing parents." (On Baptism, p. 232.) The absence, then, of any such case must be taken as a strong presumption that such children were baptized in infancy. (See Wilson on Inf. Bapt. chap. ix.)

II. We can trace infant baptism back to the days of the apostles,—which demands the conclusion that it was performed with their sanction, if not with their own hands.

It is certain, from their own testimony, that the apostles were at great pains to establish means of conveying their *directions*, *injunctions*, or *traditions* to succeeding generations. Peter says, "I will endeavor that after my decease you make mention of these things," and thereby perpetuate the remembrance of them. (2 Epistle i. 15.) Paul says, "The things which thou hast heard of me [*dia*] *for the purpose of instructing* many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii. 2.) With these facts before us, all must admit that the testimony of the men who lived near the apostolic age must be of very great weight in helping to decide what was apostolic practice. It is useless to argue a point so self-evident. Mr. Alexander Campbell agrees that "the views and practices of those who were the cotemporaries or the pupils of the apostles and their immediate successors may be adduced as corroborating evidence of the truths taught and the practices enjoined by the apostles, and as such may be cited."

It is also agreed, even by the most rabid railers against infant baptism, that this has been an established thing in all the great divisions of the Church since the fourth century. Augustine flourished at the conclusion of the fourth century, and his testimony is direct to the point that the baptizing of infants was then the common practice, and that it was *apostolica traditio*,—a thing derived from the apostles. His words are, "If any one do ask for divine authority in this matter, that which the whole Church practices, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was ever in use, is very reasonably believed to be no other than a thing delivered [or ordered] by or from the apostles." (*De Bapt. cont. Donat.*)

Chrysostom lived at the same time and left a similar testimony. A half-generation earlier lived Gregory Nazianzen, who heartily shames the mother who hesitated to bring her child to be baptized because of its tender age, urging that "Hannah consecrated Samuel to God before his birth and devoted him to the priesthood as soon as he was born," and that "so *children should be baptized in their tenderest age*, though having yet no idea of perdition or grace." About the year 250 there lived a certain minister by the name of *Fidus*, who was somewhat squeamish about baptizing new-born babes, because he was expected to kiss them after baptizing them. He therefore brought it before a council of sixty-six bishops to decide whether baptism, for the sake of decency, ought not to be denied to infants until after they were eight days old. The question shows at once that

infant baptism was then the common practice, and the council, with the martyr Cyprian at its head, at once unanimously declared that "the mercy and grace of God are to be denied to none from the moment he is born," and that, as baptism is not denied to the greatest offenders when they come to believe, so it certainly is not to be arbitrarily withheld from a new-born babe, which has no crimes.

Origen was born in 185 and died in 254. He was a distinguished man and possessed many uncommon advantages. His father, grandfather, and great-grandfather all were Christians. At the most moderate reckoning, his great-grandfather lived within twelve years of the death of Mark and about twenty years cotemporaneous with the Apostle John. For nearly a hundred years the Origen family had lived with the apostles and their immediate successors and the other "faithful men," some of whom must yet have been alive in Origen's time. He also traveled extensively, visited various apostolic Churches, and resided in many of them, in order the most fully to inform himself respecting whatever accounts of Christ and his apostles were still preserved. And it is simply impossible, under such circumstances, that the practice of the Church, derived from the apostles, in a matter of daily occurrence, could have been forgotten, or have suffered such a radical change, without his having been aware of it. Mr. Alexander Campbell says, "Origen is a competent witness in any question of fact." What, then, is his testimony? It is that "The

Church RECEIVED FROM THE APOSTLES *the injunction* [*traditio*] TO GIVE BAPTISM EVEN TO INFANTS, ACCORDING TO THE SAYING OF OUR LORD CONCERNING INFANTS." (*Orig. in Rom.* lib. 5, cap. 6, p. 543.) Again: in his homily on Leviticus, he says, "Whereas the baptism of the Church is given for the forgiveness of sins, infants also are, by the usage of the Church, baptized."

A little earlier than Origen lived Tertullian, who was the first opposer of infant baptism that has ever been heard of. But his very opposition proves that it was a common thing in his day. He certainly would not have undertaken to wage war against a mere phantom. No sane man would preach reform in a thing that never existed. And yet, as early as the conclusion of the second century, within eighty years of the time of the apostles, we find him inveighing against the baptizing of infants as *the great defect of the age*, and therefore a custom as wide-spread as Christendom itself. At that period men were still living who were born before the apostles all were dead. And how does it happen that in one lifetime from the apostles a practice which Baptists tell us is such a dreadful apostasy from the teachings of Jesus and the example of his inspired servants, should thus have established itself in every Church all over the Christian world? If this was an innovation; if it was so contrary to apostolic injunction and example; if it was the introduction of such a dreadful scourge, at war with all the inculcations of the Son of God,—where were John the apostle, and Timothy and Titus, and the "faithful men,"

able to teach others also? Where were Polycarp, and Irenæus, and Barnabas, and Hermas, that not one of them ever rose up to rebuke and expose the delusion of those who would thus forsake the commandment of God for an ordinance of man? Indeed, the very arguments which Tertullian employed against infant baptism show that he himself considered it impossible to deny its apostolic origin, and felt all the time that he was laboring to introduce a new practice. He believed that baptism was the washing away of sins; and his great argument was that it should be delayed until the periods of greater temptation had passed, lest by sinning after baptism there would be found no more remission. This was the foundation of all his opposition, and led him to oppose the baptism of unmarried grown people as well as little children. But, if the baptizing of infants was an antichristian innovation, there was another argument within his reach, and which he must needs have hit upon, far more conclusive than this. Why did he not brand the practice as a novelty and fiction of the day? Why did he not declare it to be a thing unknown to the apostles and apostolic Churches? Why did he not say that it was not so from the beginning? If it was an innovation, there were men then living within whose recollection it was introduced. Why, then, did he not appeal to them and say, "The traditions of the apostles were delivered to your grandfathers: ask them; for they know and will tell you that baptism was never designed for infants"? Such an argument would have been conclusive. It

would have ended the question and given triumph to his opposition. Why did he not use it? It is evident that *he could not.* And the simple fact that he passes it in silence, reasoning only from his own principles, shows that anti-pedobaptism was no stronger in its resources then than now, and that the baptizing of infants is a practice as certainly derived from the apostles as the Church itself.

Polycarp was the pupil of the Apostle John, and Irenæus was the disciple of Polycarp. At an advanced age Irenæus says of his teacher, "I remember his discourses to the people concerning the conversations he had with John the apostle and others *who had seen the Lord;* how he rehearsed their discourses, and what he heard them that were eye-witnesses of the Word of Life say of our Lord and of his miracles and doctrine." This shows that Polycarp had used his opportunities. He was himself master of whatever was to be known. He had been careful to tell all that he knew of our Lord or the apostles and of their doctrine and practice. These discourses had made a deep and unfading impression on the mind of Irenæus. And Irenæus was yet a living teacher when Tertullian broached his doctrine for the delay of baptism until the season of severest temptation was past. If infant baptism had not been sanctioned by the example of the apostles, Irenæus must have known it, and Tertullian might have appealed to him and settled the question. Or, if Tertullian's doctrine had had apostolic sanction, Irenæus certainly could not

have been ignorant of it, and would have supported the attempted reformation of his neighbor. But the teachings of Tertullian were dead-born and fell lifeless upon the ear of the Church.

Nay, Irenæus, so far from presenting infant baptism as opposed to the practice of the apostles and the doctrine of Christ, has left a passage on record which, though much debated, supports the doctrine of infant baptism against all the ingenuity and learning that have been marshaled to break its force, and assigns it a place in the very marrow of the gospel. "*Christ*," says he, "*came to save all*,—ALL WHO BY HIM ARE RE-BORN OF GOD, INFANTS, LITTLE ONES, CHILDREN, *youths, and persons of mature age: therefore he passed through these several ages.*" The relevancy of this passage rests upon the phrase "*re-born of God*,"—*renascuntur in Deum.* We maintain that it refers to *baptism*, and that Irenæus here recognizes the baptism of "infants, little ones, and children," as well as persons of mature age. Baptists insist that it means "spiritual regeneration," "conversion to God," "moral renewal in Christ." Dr. Fuller thinks that "Professor Sears has settled forever this matter by an elaborate investigation of the works of Irenæus." What Mr. Sears has said we are not informed; but we have before us Dr. Chase's tract on the subject, which Dr. Fuller pronounces "*most learned*" and founded upon the "reading and re-reading of every line of all the extant works of Irenæus." And if Professor Sears has done as much toward the settlement of the matter as Dr. Chase, it is in a different direction from

that supposed by either of them. After all his "elaborate investigation," Dr. Chase says, "I do not hesitate to admit that Irenæus *sometimes speaks of regeneration as being connected with* BAPTISM." We also learn from this tract that Irenæus calls the commission to make disciples by baptism "*the authority of* REGENERATION UNTO GOD,"—not the power to renew men's spiritual nature, for no man can do that, but the right to administer *baptism.* This too is precisely the phrase used in our quotation. In the same tract we also find that Irenæus calls "the one healing remedy by which our sins are removed," "*logiko baptismata,*—a discriminate or proper *baptism.*" The Gnostics, who taught a salvation by mere internal illumination, he denounced as "men sent by Satan to *deny the baptism of regeneration unto God.*" The baptismal application of water to the body he calls the "*regeneration of the flesh.*" How, then, dare Dr. Fuller say that when Irenæus speaks of infants being "*re-born unto God,*" or "*regenerated of God,*" he means spiritual renovation to the entire exclusion of baptism? Dr. Chase expressly testifies that, "*in some degree,* AT LEAST, *he* [*Irenæus*] *confounded the sign with the thing signified,—confounded baptism with regeneration;*" and, if he confounded them at all, where is the evidence that he viewed them distinct from each other in this quotation? Our opponents themselves being witness, Irenæus over and over again, in multiform profusion, calls baptism *regeneration,* our *renatus in Deum,* our *re-birth to God.* Alexander Campbell—perhaps the most competent witness on that point in the Baptist world—says,

"*All the apostolical* Fathers, as they are called, all the pupils of the apostles, and all the ecclesiastical writers of note of the first four centuries, whose writings have come down to us, allude to and speak of Christian immersion [*baptism*] as *the regeneration and remission of sins* spoken of in the New Testament. . . . I AM ASSURED *that they used the term* REGENERATED *as equivalent to immersion* [BAPTISM], and spake of the spiritual change under other terms and modes of speech." (Debate with Rice, pp. 416, 430.)

When Irenæus therefore comes to speak of "INFANTS, *and little ones, and children*, and youths, and persons of mature age," all as *regenerated*,—"re-born of God" to salvation in Jesus Christ,—it is useless for Baptists or anybody else to tell us that the passage has no allusion to baptism.

But suppose we take the Baptist theory,—that the phrase means spiritual regeneration, conversion to God, and moral renewal in Christ. Will that take from the passage its testimony in favor of infant baptism? Can we put asunder what God hath joined together? If "infants, and little ones, and children" are spiritually regenerated, converted to God, and renewed in Christ,—and Irenæus looked upon them in this light,—would or could he have consistently denied to them the outward sign and sacrament of these sublime spiritual transactions? If infants are the subjects of all these inward experiences, and are "re-born of God," are they not disciples of Christ, and to be marked as disciples according to the Savior's command? So that whether Irenæus meant spiritual

regeneration or not, *baptism* is inevitably implicated, and goes along with the meaning of the phrase as certainly as the shadow follows the substance. Dr. Neander says that "in Irenæus baptism and regeneration are intimately connected," and that "it is difficult to conceive how the term *regeneration* can be employed, in reference to this age, to denote any thing else than baptism." He therefore regards this passage as presenting direct and incontrovertible proof of the existence of infant baptism in the time of Irenæus. But if this regeneration (*renascunter in Deum*) does not denote *baptism*, it certainly does denote every thing that can entitle a man to baptism. In either case "infants and little ones" are designated as proper subjects of baptism; and that by a man of God who received the apostolic traditions from a companion and pupil of him who lay closest to the Savior's heart. Can any one doubt, then, as to the views and practices of the apostles on this subject?

Justin Martyr lived still nearer to the time of the apostles. In one of his Apologies, written about the year 148, he says there were among Christians in his time many persons of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years old, who had been *made disciples to Christ from their infancy* and continued undefiled all their lives. If these persons were made disciples in infancy, they were baptized in infancy. If they were baptized but twenty years before Justin was born, they were baptized before all the apostles were dead; and we thus have infant baptism carried up to the very lifetime of the apostles. And if infant baptism was prac-

ticed whilst the apostles yet lived, who can say that it was without apostolic sanction? Dr. Fuller says that Justin in this passage does not allude to baptism. But, as one assertion is as good in the way of proof as another, we say *he does* refer to baptism, and in the very words of the commission. And Dr. Neander says that he here, "BEYOND QUESTION, *refers to baptism.*" How indeed can infants be made disciples to Christ, according to the commission, but by baptism?

Dr. Fuller professes to quote assertions from sundry modern authors to the effect that there were no infant baptisms in the first two centuries. We have already had some interesting specimens of his way of quoting authorities; and the facts here are of very much the same sort. The point which he endeavors to sustain is, that infant baptism is a mere human invention, corruptly introduced into the Church long after the apostles were in their graves. To this point he refers to several neologians of Germany, as if they were competent witnesses in the case, and to several other writers, such as Baumgarten, Olshausen, and Neander, as if they believed and taught that infant baptism is a mere device of men, unauthorized by, and a miserable perversion of, the gospel, when it *is a notorious fact that they defended and practiced it themselves, as a thing lying in the very soul and life of Christianity.* Dr. Fuller's mode of quoting authorities makes knaves and fools of some of the best and most consistent men who have lived to adorn and bless the Church by their piety and wisdom.

It must be admitted, however, that some writers

have uttered themselves as incredulous upon the subject of the apostolicity of infant baptism, and that their names stand upon the Baptist side of this question. But it is also true that a far greater number of men, as competent as they to tell us where the truth on this question lies, including the most patient and thorough investigators of the original sources of evidence, take the ground that infant baptism is a thing warranted by the Scriptures of truth, practiced in the apostolic times, and handed down to us from those whom Christ himself ordained to be the founders of his Church and the expositors of his holy institutes. Among these we may mention Vossius, Luther, Gerhard, Chemnitz, Quenstedt, Baier, Forbes, Hammond, Walker, Dupin, Bingham, and Wall,—names that will stand on this subject against any in Christendom who can be marshaled on the Baptist side. Dr. Wall, whose lengthy and thorough examinations have about exhausted the subject, concludes with these words :—

"As these evidences are for the first four hundred years, in which there appears one man, Tertullian, that advises the delay of infant baptism in some cases, and one Gregory that did, perhaps, practice such delay in the case of his children, but no society of men so thinking or so practicing, nor no one man saying it was unlawful to baptize infants, so in the next seven hundred years there is not so much as one man to be found that either spoke for or practiced any such delay; but all the contrary. And when, about the year 1130, one sect among the Albigenses declared against the baptizing of

infants, *as being incapable of salvation*, the main body of that people rejected their opinion; and they of them that held that opinion quickly dwindled away and disappeared, there being no more heard of holding that tenet till the rising of the German anti-Pedobaptists, anno 1552." (Wall on Infant Baptism, vol. ii. ch. 10, p. 501.)

We have thus traced the baptizing of infants as the common Church-practice back through history into the very lifetime of the apostles. We find the overwhelming majority of the best and most knowing Christian men in all ages and countries defending and practicing it as a true and proper use of the baptismal sacrament. How, then, can it be viewed as any thing other than a divine appointment, lying in the very bosom of Christianity from the beginning? If it was not introduced by the apostles, when was it introduced? If it was not begun by authority of the great Author of our religion, by whose authority and by what process was it begun? To these inquiries all history is silent; and the world-wide practice of infant baptism stands forth a greater riddle than the pyramids of Egypt or the wasting memorials of Yucatan. Christians are dumb as Fejees as to the origin of some of their most cherished rites; and the Christian world in a day completely changed one of its commonest services without having been made conscious of it for fifteen hundred years!

III. But more than all this: we have clear *scriptural evidence* that the apostles did practice infant baptism. Though they were all missionaries, sent

out among unbelieving Jews and heathens, surrounded by circumstances different from those in established Christian communities, and of course not baptizing anybody until some of the adults—with whom alone they could begin—professed their willingness to become disciples, we yet have explicit information that they did baptize *entire families*,—OIKOI,—*houses*,—*offspring of the same parents*,—CHILDREN, *including any and every age*. In Acts xvi. 14, 15, we read of "a certain woman named Lydia, whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended to the things that were spoken of Paul. *And she was baptized*, AND HER [OIKOS] HOUSEHOLD." In the same chapter we also read of a terrified jailer, whom Paul directed to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," promising upon these conditions that he should be saved, *and his* (*oikos*) *house;* whereupon he "*was baptized, he* AND ALL HIS." In 1 Cor. i. 16, Paul declares, "And I *baptized also* THE [OIKON] HOUSEHOLD OF STEPHANUS." In Acts x. 2, we read of "a devout man, and one that feared God," whom Peter baptized "*with all his* [OIKO] *house.*" In Acts xviii. 8, we also read of "Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue," who was baptized with "*all his* [*oiko*] *house.*" In 2 Tim. i. 16 and iv. 19, we find mention of "*the* [*oiko*] *house of Onesiphorus*" in a way which leads us to believe that all its members had been baptized, and that mention, moreover, made only for their father's sake. Nor is there any good reason why the families of Aristobulus and Narcissus (Rom. xvi. 10, 11) should not also be in the list of apostolic household baptisms.

Here, then, are eight OIKO,—*families*,—four of

them explicitly said to have been baptized by the apostles, and *all* referred to as *Christian* families, and therefore certainly not unbaptized. Have we eight instances of the administration of the Lord's Supper? Not half that number. Have we eight cases of the change of the Jewish into the Christian Sabbath? Perhaps not one-fourth of that number. Yet the communion and this change of day are vindicated by apostolic practice as recorded in the New Testament. How can we, then, deny that the apostles baptized children with their parents, when it is established by a series of instances more numerous than can be found in support of any other doctrine, principle, or practice handed down from apostolic times?

Dr. Fuller thinks that Lydia's "household" consisted only of *servants* and such as were associated with her in conducting her business, and that the "house" of the jailer was perhaps similarly constituted. But we deny that *oikos*, when used as in these passages, ever signifies servants and attendants in the New Testament. It primarily denotes *blood-lineage, progeny*, CHILDREN. "The house [*oikos*] of Israel" means the children of Israel, "the house of David" the lineal descendants of David, "the house of Judah" the progeny of Judah; and not the servants and employees of Israel, David, and Judah. "*Oikos*," says Aristotle, "is a companionship connected together *according to the course of nature*." "The first social connection," says Cicero, "is the conjugal, then that of *children;* AND THESE CONSTITUTE A DOMUS,—*a house or family*." "I know Abraham," saith the Lord, "that he will command *his*

children, even *his* HOUSE [*oiko*], after him." When Joseph was made "governor over Egypt," he was certainly made master of all Pharaoh's servants and slaves; and when it is added that he was also made "governor over all Pharaoh's *house*," (*oikos*,) we are thereby assured that even the king's own *children* were put in subjection to him. Indeed, we know of not one single case in the New Testament, in the Septuagint, or in all the Greek classics, where the word *oikos*, when used as in these accounts of household baptisms, does not *specifically, directly, and unequivocally refer to* CHILDREN, and for the most part to children *exclusively*. Talk of *oikos* meaning only attendants and slaves! Why, every Greek scholar would laugh to scorn such an idea and utterly despise the man who should undertake to maintain it. It has no such meaning. Nor is it more certain that the word *dog* does not mean a *sheep* or an *ass* than that *oikos* never means only *servants*. Dr. Carson refers to the Septuagint version of 1 Kings v. 9 in proof that it "includes domestics;" but the word in that passage is not *oikos*, but DOULOS,—the proper word for servants; and in iv. 7, where the word is *oikos*, it denotes those whom the *douloi* serve,—the king's *household*, for whom the servants were to bring victuals. Useless is the effort of our Baptist friends to get children out of *oikos*. It everywhere denotes blood-lineage, the fruit of conjugal union; and if Dr. Fuller can have this *without* INFANTS, we would call the scientific world to come and behold the greatest wonder that has been since the creation. Surely we need not be surprised that a man should

not find infants included in a command to baptize "all nations," when he fails to discover them among the fruits of those methods of procreation determined and established in our nature by the Hand that made us!

We hold that *oikos* means the fruit of wedlock,—progeny,—*children;* and that there can be no *oikos* of persons without children. The *oikoi* of Lydia, the jailer, Cornelius, and Stephanus were therefore *the children* of Lydia, the jailer, Cornelius, and Stephanus. It is a fact that the earliest and perhaps the best translation of the New Testament—the Syriac—says of Lydia that "she was baptized WITH HER CHILDREN." And, as by children we mean *children*, it remains for Dr. Fuller to show that these were adults before he can set aside the conclusion that the apostles verily baptized children. But, although he has all the force of the laws of language and all the conclusions of the most every-day observation against him, he must needs make the attempt. He tells us that Lydia's children were grown men, because they "are expressly declared to have been *brethren*, whom the apostles saw and comforted" when released from prison. (P. 142.) Did ever any man see such contumacy and such determination at all hazards to carry a sectarian dogma? Let the reader but examine the 16th chapter of Acts, and he will see that a more glaring perversion of God's word is hardly to be found. Paul was at "Derbe and Lystra." He there found "a certain disciple named Timothy. . . . Him Paul would have to go forth with him." And "when *they* [Paul and Silas

and Timothy] had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, *they* passed by Mysia and came down to Troas." A vision appeared to Paul; and, after he had seen the vision, Luke says, "WE [Paul, Silas, Timothy, and I, Luke] endeavored to go into Macedonia. Therefore, loosing from Troas, WE came to Samothracia, and the next day to Neapolis, and from thence to Philippi. . . . And on the Sabbath WE went out to the Proseucha, and WE sat down and spake to the women that resorted thither. . . . Lydia . . . heard US, . . . and constrained US to come into her house and *abide there.*" Who, then, were this WE and US, if not Paul, Silas, Timothy, and Luke, the writer of the account? This was the company journeying together and which lodged together at the house of Lydia. "And it came to pass," says Luke, "as WE went to prayer, a certain damsel possessed with a spirit of divination met US: the same followed *us.* . . . But Paul, being grieved, cast out the spirit. And when her masters saw that the hope of their gains was gone, they caught *Paul and Silas* [not Timothy and Luke], . . . laid many stripes upon them, and cast them into prison." Paul and Silas were now in jail; but "*the brethren*"—Timothy and Luke, of course—continued at their lodgings in the house of Lydia. During the night God heard the prayers of the prisoners and miraculously struck off their chains. "And they went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia," and saw "*the brethren.*" What *brethren?* A Sabbath-school child would not miss the true answer. Certainly, not Lydia's grown-up sons; for it is nowhere to be

found that she ever had sons, much less sons grown up at that period of her life. Who, then, were the parties abiding in Lydia's house entitled to be noted down as so peculiarly "*the brethren*" of Paul and Silas? Unquestionably, their companions in travel and fellow-missionaries of the cross, *Timothy and Luke.*

There is no proof, then, that Lydia's children were any thing but children. And if even the youngest of them was only less than ten years of age, the last refuge of the Baptists is swept away, and the truth, rising to assert its rightful empire, proclaims to the four winds that *the apostles did baptize children,* and regarded themselves as authorized and bound to do so under their commission. A single fact like this is invincible in our favor against all abstract or analogical reasoning that the human mind shall ever breed.

Dr. Fuller also insinuates that the jailer's children were not children, because it is said that "*he rejoiced*, believing in God, with all his house." "See there!" says he: "after all, these babes are old enough to know spiritual joy and to utter praises to God!" Well, be it so,—though the record nowhere says it: we know that God has "*perfected praise*" out of the mouths of "*babes and* SUCKLINGS." Tender infancy presents no insuperable impediment to it. Jeremiah was sanctified before he was born. John was "filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb." Baxter loved God prior to his earliest recollection. And if Dr. Fuller will visit some of the Sunday-schools of Baltimore, he will find *infant classes* uttering

praises as perfect and from hearts as pure as ever honored the earthly assemblies of God's worshipers. And if the jailer's babes could know joy and utter praise, they still may have been mere "babes and sucklings," or else the testimony of God must give place to the narrow conceits of man's philosophy.

But, says Dr. Fuller, "such infants as these I shall be happy to baptize every day of my life." Ah! and where would he get the authority for it? From the commission? He says the commission utterly excludes infants. In apostolic practice? He holds that the apostles never baptized any but adults. By what right, then, would he baptize "babes and sucklings"? The case admits of but one alternative. It is either his duty or it is not his duty to baptize all such infants as are to be viewed as non-resistants of divine grace and learners in the school of Christ. If such is his duty, then there is authority and obligation for baptizing some babes at least, and infant baptism is no perversion of Christianity after all. And if it is not his duty to baptize any babes whatever, then we must conclude that there is more authority for baptizing an old conjurer, hardened in sin by the confirmed habit of many years, and actually "in the gall of bitterness and in the bonds of iniquity," than there is for baptizing holy ones like the infant John, or for giving the sign of consecration to Christ to those "*babes and sucklings*" *out of whose mouths* GOD HIMSELF HAS PERFECTED PRAISE. Dr. Fuller may take either side of the dilemma, and one side he must take, and his refusal to baptize

the children of believers shows itself to be an utter absurdity.

The record, however, says nothing about "spiritual joy" or "praises to God" in connection with the jailer's children. The words are explicit that *he himself* did the rejoicing, "believing in God." This he did, not in the *absence* of his family, but "*with all his house*," those old enough sympathizing with him in the joy of his marvellous deliverance from impending death, and the youngest not excluded from the scene of his festivity. Nay, if the jailer's children were adults, how did it happen that Paul promised salvation to them all on the condition of their father's faith? The apostle said *to the jailer alone*, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and *thou* shalt be saved, *and thy* [*oikos*] *children*." Upon the Baptist theory let Dr. Fuller explain this if he can, and tell us whether, when he immerses an aged father, he thereupon promises salvation to all his grown-up sons and daughters. No, no, Dr. Fuller: your jocularity with Dr. Kurtz will not relieve the stern difficulties of your forced interpretation of this passage. Admit that the children of believers are entitled to baptism, and every thing is explained; deny this, and the whole case is forever inexplicable. The Bible says that the jailer's children were baptized along with himself, and that salvation was promised to them on the ground of their father's faith; and the double inference is therefore inevitable, that they were not of an age to make a Christian profession for themselves, and that the apostles did actually baptize children.

As to the children of Stephanus, Dr. Fuller

holds that they were all adults when baptized: *first*, because it is said that "many of the Corinthians believed and were baptized;" though there is no evidence that Stephanus was a Corinthian, he and his house (*oikos*) being "the first-fruits of *Achaia;*" and, *second*, because it is said of them that they had "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." But great changes occur in growing families in the course of eight or ten years. The boy in the year 51, when Stephanus and his house were baptized, would naturally be a man in the year 59, when this record was made. The eldest of the children of Stephanus may have been ten or fifteen years old when they were baptized, whilst others may have been mere babes; and yet it might easily be said of them, ten years afterward, that they had shown much kindness to their fellow-Christians. David slew Goliath and put the Philistine army to flight when but a ruddy youth. Samuel served as a minister in the tabernacle when but a little boy. Our Sabbath-schools contain many a child entitled to be called an angel of mercy for its good deeds toward the poor and suffering. And why could not these children, especially under a pious father's guidance, some of whom were now pretty well grown up, addict themselves to ministering unto the saints, although ten years previous some of them were no more than babes? Does Dr. Fuller hold that "once an infant always an infant," and maintain that because this family was noted for its kindness in A.D. 60, not one of its members could have been under ten or twelve years old in A.D. 50? If not, then all the stress

which he lays upon the Christian activity of these "first-fruits of Achaia," ten years after they were baptized, must pass for nothing; and we are left to believe that the children of Stephanus, when baptized by Paul, were no more than children. Indeed, the very manner in which we come to know any thing about this baptism is conclusive evidence that even so long after the baptizing had been performed these children were yet too young to be of any material force in the affairs of the Church. Factions had sprung up at Corinth. One was for Paul, another for Apollos, and a third for Peter. A letter is written to rebuke these disorders. Paul, the writer of it, sets himself to show the absurdity of such a thing as a Paul party in that Church. He tells them that he had been crucified for nobody, and that with his own hand he had not even baptized any but Crispus and Gaius, who do not seem to have taken the general infection. These were the only men of influence who could so much as claim him as their baptizer. And then, with a certain tardiness, as if he were undecided as to whether it would be worth while to mention it, he remarks, "*However, I baptized also the household of Stephanus,*" intimating that they were hardly to be taken into account on this question, as they were not of sufficient influence or age to be much support to any party. He first passes them altogether:— "I thank God that I baptized *none of you but Crispus and Gaius.*" We demand of Dr. Fuller the reason of this total omission. Had Paul forgotten? Can an inspired man, recording his own official acts, forget? There is no explanation, and

can be none, except upon the ground that these children of Stephanus were yet *minors*, even eight or ten years after their baptism, and for that reason quite out of the question which the apostle had before him. If they had been adults, they were just as likely to be Paulians, because Paul had baptized them, as Crispus and Gaius; and it could only be because they were still too young to have any thing to do with these party disputes that Paul esteemed it hardly worth while to refer to them in such a connection. If this does not prove that children were among the subjects of apostolic baptism, we know nothing about the force of evidence.

The house of Stephanus "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." To this Mr. Ewing has a very just remark:—"Were this a proof," says he, "that they had among them no infants, we might find a proof that the house of the Rechabites had among them no infants, because in Jer. xxxv. 2–11, they addicted themselves to perform the commandment of their father. The general terms are even stronger in the latter instance than in the former; but in both the exceptions of infancy may be equally understood." (On Baptism, p. 190.)

We therefore hold Dr. Fuller to the plain and direct meaning of the word *oikos*. It denotes *children*. And when we have the unequivocal testimony of the Scriptures that the apostles did baptize *oikoi*, before the dogma of the Baptists can stand they must prove that the members of these *oikoi* were all adults. We have the word which, as

certainly as any word in any language, comprehends infants; and we are therefore bound to hold that infants are included and were baptized until the most unmistakable proof to the contrary has been produced. Such proof has never been produced. A book, written about thirty years ago, to prove that infants were included in the *oikoi* baptized by the apostles, was submitted to the Baptists of Britain, with a challenge for their refutation. Years passed, but no refutation was attempted. The book was even submitted to a Baptist association, with the most respectful solicitation that they would either admit the truth of its positions or have them refuted; but the request was answered with a formal resolution *to disregard it!* And from that day to the present moment *Taylor's Facts and Evidences on the Subjects of Christian Baptism* REMAIN UNANSWERED, AND WITHOUT AN ATTEMPT AT AN ANSWER, *by any Baptist on either side of the Atlantic Ocean.*

If the baptizing of infants, then, is to be denounced as such a horrible crime, let Baptists first show us how they exempt God's inspired apostles from the dreadful crimination by answering the invincible positions of that learned advocate of the truth whom Dr. Fuller mentions only to call "*the silly editor of Calmet.*"

Indeed, with the facts before us, that *oikos* means family, and that the apostles baptized certainly not less than *eight* such families, the plainest common sense will infer with the firmest confidence that *they must have baptized infants.* Take eight families at a venture in any street, town, village,

or neighborhood, or eight pews containing families in a place of worship, and in all of them not to find one child under ten years of age would be a circumstance sufficiently strange to be heralded from sea to sea, as showing that the world is coming to an end, sure enough. Take the average number of children in a family to be *six;* these eight families would include *forty-eight* children; and yet, among forty-eight children of parents not past the busy activities of middle life, not to find *one* child under eight or ten years of age would be truly wonderful. Who can believe it? Who, then, can doubt that the apostles baptized infants?

There is another thought which we will yet present.

The Greek words *pistos* and *pistoi,* a *faithful* and *faithfuls,* when applied to persons in the New Testament, designate them as church-members,— as persons belonging to the household of faith. (See 1 Cor. iv. 17; Eph. vi. 21; Col. iv. 9; 1 Pet. v. 12; Acts xvi. 1; 1 Tim. v. 16, vi. 2, iv. 12; Eph. i. 1; Col. i. 2.) The term implies all that is included in Christian discipleship; and in the case of Lydia it is so strongly connected with baptism as to be interchangeable with it. "When she was baptized with her family, she besought us, saying, If [*since*] you have adjudged me to be a *pistaen* [*a faithful*] to the Lord, come into my house and abide there." (Acts xvi. 15.) The sense in this passage would be the same if we were to put the term *baptized* in the place of *faithful* and *faithful* for *baptized.* It is impossible to conceive how an

individual can be one and not the other, as the Christian Church is constituted. And to call one *a faithful* is equivalent to calling him *a Christian brother*, a disciple of Christ. But Paul to Titus (i. 6) explicitly applies this term to *children*. Speaking of the qualities to be possessed by a bishop, the apostle says, "He must be the husband of one wife, *having* CHILDREN [*tekna*] *who are* FAITHFULS." The word *tekna* is used to denote the children, "*from two years old and under*," that Herod ordered to be slain in and about Bethlehem. A certain Baptist writer admits that it means "*all minors from twenty days old*." The apostle makes no distinction between the eldest and the youngest. Of whatever age, he here makes it a part of a bishop's business to have his children *faithfuls*. We find also that John, in his Epistle, which is written to *faithfuls*, (1 John v. 13,) distinguishes between *fathers*, *young men*, *and* LITTLE CHILDREN. (ii. 12, 13.) Would the apostles have given these significant Christian titles to little children whilst they denied to them Christian Church-membership and Christian baptism? It cannot be.

We think that we have now made out our case. We have shown that, if the apostles did not baptize the children of believers in infancy and childhood, there is no evidence in Scripture that they ever baptized them at all. We have traced infant baptism as the practice of the Church up to the lifetime of some of the apostles. We have shown that they baptized numerous *oikoi*, or families in which there must have been children, and that they applied names to children which must needs

be out of place except upon the admission that they were baptized children. And we think the conclusion inevitable, from these premises, that infant baptism is a thing with authority as high as that for Christianity itself; that it is a thing founded on apostolic sanction, and, therefore, of divine appointment. We would have much more to say upon the general subject, but we can see no occasion for it.

In winding up a very well conducted argument on the subject of "Domestic Slavery," Dr. Fuller finally settles down upon this as a sound principle: —"*What God sanctioned in the Old Testament and permitted in the New, cannot be a sin.*" We agree with the logic of that argument and with the conclusion which it is designed to support. And if the doctor will apply it to the subject of infant Church-membership, he will find it vastly more powerful *against* him on this question than it was *for* him in the cause in which he called it to his aid. God not only "*sanctioned*" infant Church-membership in the Old Testament, but positively *ordained and required it.* And in the New Testament he not only permitted it, but so spoke and acted with regard to children, and so moved his inspired servants to act and speak on the subject, as inevitably to lead the mind of the Christian world to believe that, so far from abridging the former immunities of children, their position and rights under the gospel are vastly elevated and enlarged. AND WHAT GOD COMMANDED IN THE OLD TESTAMENT, AND BY WORD AND DEED SANCTIONED IN THE NEW, CANNOT BE A SIN.

Go, then, Christian parent, and, with a fervent and confiding heart, offer your children in solemn consecration to Him who made them, in the holy ordinance which he himself has appointed. Go; let them be marked by Christ's commissioned ambassador as members beloved of the Savior's fold; for he hath said, "*Of such is the kingdom of heaven.*" Give them to your blessed Lord in the sacrament of his love and mercy; for he hath promised, "*Whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily shall in no wise lose his reward.*" Bring them; and in the name of Jesus we will receive them into the bosom of the Church, which is his body; for he hath declared, "WHOSO SHALL RECEIVE ONE SUCH LITTLE CHILD IN MY NAME RECEIVETH ME."

It was the remark of a certain itinerant preacher that there are *but two places* of which he had ever heard in which there are no infants: the one is *hell*, the other is *the Baptist Church.*

CHAPTER XXV.

TERMS OF COMMUNION.

It only remains for us now to make a few comments on Dr. Fuller's "*Terms of Communion*," and we have done.

It is a gratification to know that these "*terms*" are not endorsed by all Baptists. Some immersionists—especially on the other side of the Atlantic—repudiate them with deserved abhorrence. The reader shall hear from a few of them before we close. But Baptists generally, and with very few exceptions in this country, defend and practice just such "terms" as those presented by Dr. Fuller, and which we feel called on to hold up to the indignation of a right-feeling Christian public.

Dr. Fuller thinks that it is "not right," that it is "unkind," "unjust," "ungenerous," "mischievous," "and deserves no better name than *croaking*," "to speak against the Baptists for their practice in communion." (P. 247.) He sees nothing of this sort, however, in the everlasting railing of Baptist champions against millions of God's people for their practice *in baptism*. But if our *baptism* is to be open to the harsh censures and maledictions of Baptists, we should like to know by what laws of right or principles of just reason

we are to be barred from forming and uttering *our* opinions concerning their *communion.* We do not advocate the return of railing for railing, or the meeting of abuse with abuse. Being smitten on the one cheek, we would rather turn the other also. But when a brother is so bent upon removing a mote from our eye, we claim the privilege of asking him to remove the beam from his own. We do not complain that our practice in baptism is canvassed, probed, and discussed. What we do we do openly, and invite the closest scrutiny into the righteousness of our proceedings. We have nothing which we desire to be taken for granted or which we are afraid to have investigated. If we are the abettors of "damnable heresy," we will esteem it a great favor to have it shown us and to be brought to the knowledge of the truth. And if Dr. Fuller has one-half of the love for us and for the truth which he professes, he ought not to be so nervous on the subject of a little moral cautery which his "dear brethren" may deem necessary.

But we can easily see and understand why he would prefer to have nothing said "against the Baptists for their practice in communion." It touches a very sore point. It comes too near the quick and life of his system. It denudes a feature of his cause which is too unlovely for the public eye, and lays open its heart in a light in no way very creditable or flattering to its advocates. It discloses a posture of things in the framework of Baptist principles with which it is not particularly pleasant to face the common sense of the

community; a posture of things which reduces our immersionist friends to the unenviable alternative of surrendering their sectarian dogmas on baptism, or of excommunicating ninety-nine hundredths of Christendom, including the great body of the best and holiest saints. It presents

> "A strong dilemma in a desperate case:—
> *To act with infamy, or quit the place.*"

This is a trying strait. No wonder that it should excite a wish to have nothing said. Dr. Fuller thinks it very hard that Baptists are compelled to occupy such a position. He mourns over it bitterly. He speaks of it as giving him more pain than the pains of excommunication. (Pp. 239, 247.) He languishes under it as if it would "break his heart." (P. 244.) He complains of it as a positive cruelty inflicted by those whom he so dearly loves. (P. 247.) O ye saints of God and "noble lights and ornaments of Christianity," why will ye thus torment the man? Why will ye blame *him* for your being saints without submission to his opinions? Poor, bleeding soul! He never meant that you should be the children of God in this way! Oh, how "unkind" and "ungenerous," ye servants of Jesus, that you should become the heirs of heaven without immersion, when the dear lover of your souls who wrote a book is under the deplorable necessity of excommunicating you or surrendering his opinion on the meaning of *baptizo!!*

In treating further on this subject, we propose, *first*, to present the terms of communion which Baptists set up; *second*, to notice the arguments

used to sustain them; and, *third*, to point out some of their unchristian and disgraceful implications.

I. THE TERMS THEMSELVES.—These may be thus summed up: *That no man, and no woman, though pious as the Apostle John or the Virgin Mary, has any right or claim whatever to the communion of the Lord's Supper without being first totally immersed in water.* Dr. Fuller says, "I rejoice to know that in Pedobaptist [that is, *our*] Churches there are some of the noblest lights and ornaments of Christianity." (P. 238.) But he says of these same persons, "*We cannot admit them to the Supper.*" "Baptism," says he, "is a pre-requisite to the Supper; and we cannot admit to the Supper those whom we regard as unbaptized, however much we may love them, however deeply we may lament the necessity laid upon us. To do this [that is, admit them to the Supper] would be to declare such persons qualified for membership in our Churches; which would be to admit members without baptism [*immersion*]; which would be to abolish baptism [immersion] altogether." (P. 237.) Professor Curtis, in the name of the whole denomination with which he co-operates, says, "There is to us a most obvious inconsistency in admitting to our occasional communion those whom we should be unwilling to admit to our Church-fellowship," (p. 108;) that "if the Lord's Supper is a Church-ordinance, and indicates a Church-fellowship among all those who partake together, it is a violation of truth in symbols to invite to occasional communion those whom our constitutional principles would forbid to

be members of our churches," (p. 142;) and that, "as it is taken for granted in this discussion that Christian baptism essentially involves an immersion of the body in water, as a profession of personal faith in Christ, so it follows that this whole discussion must be founded on the acknowledgment that *our Pedobaptist friends are without valid baptism.* Nor can it make any abatement from this conclusion, or alteration in regard to our receiving them at the Lord's table, that they do not perceive this." (P. 142.) Professor Curtis's elaborate work "*on Communion*" embraces over three hundred pages. It is devoted entirely to the explanation and defence of "the Baptist practice in communion." The quotations we have given contain its sum and essence. It is meant to vindicate the Baptists in their enforcement of their opinions on baptism by the pains of excommunication, and in exalting the same into an essential condition of Church-fellowship. "*The Tennessee Baptist*" sheet thus discourses on the same point:—"I may err; but I do most conscientiously believe *that* AFFILIATION WITH PEDOBAPTISTS *is the fruit, not of the Holy Spirit, but the spirit of indifferentism and pantheism; that it has done, and is still* DOING, MORE TO IMPEDE THE SPREAD OF THE GOSPEL THAN ROMANISM, MAHOMEDANISM, HEATHENISM, AND INFIDELITY COMBINED; *that not until it is cast out will Zion appear in her robes of victory and the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Christ.*" According to this writer, not only Baptist consistency and the integrity of the Baptist system

depend on refusal to commune or affiliate with non-immersionists, but also the triumphs of Christendom, the evangelization of the nations, and the conversion of the world!

We have been told that Baptists all over the land are thrilling with the thought that on them exclusively devolves the work of giving the word of God to the nations. We here find them "conscientiously believing" that on their refusal to commune with any but Baptists depends the world's redemption. Yet Professor Curtis thinks "a serious deficiency of our [*their*] modern Church-fellowship is the want of more of what may be termed the *esprit du corps*"! (P. 58.) May we not hope to hear next that the universe revolves on baptisteries, and that with Baptists rests the regulation of planetary motions and sidereal centres? We await the recuperation of the lacking "*esprit*" with large expectations!

Dr. Fuller speaks of the Baptists as a persecuted people. He says "that upon the Baptist Churches has descended in unmitigated entail the not very enviable distinction noticed in this passage,—'*As concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against.*'" (P. 213.) He also states that the chief and only serious ground of this "accusation against the Baptist Churches is that of illiberality in what is called close communion," to which he finds himself, as he says, "required to conform." (P. 219.)

It is therefore a settled point, which we would have distinctly understood and noted for continual reference in connection with this controversy, that

it is *the rule*—a cherished principle, a thing held vitally essential to the whole Baptist system of faith and practice—that none of their members are ever to take the Lord's Supper with other denominations, or ever to allow any who are not Baptists to receive the Lord's Supper from them, no matter though the persons excluded be among "the noblest lights and ornaments of Christianity." As remarked by the chosen champion of "close communion" and published by the "American Baptist Publication Society," "We [Baptists] take our stand upon this: *that if the Lord's Supper is a Church-ordinance, if it is the appointed symbol of Church-relations, it should only be celebrated together with those with whom we can consistently sustain these relations;*" that is, EXCLUSIVELY WITH BAPTISTS. (Curtis on Communion, p. 108.) The italicizing is from Mr. Curtis himself.

II. Having thus ascertained what are the Baptist "terms of communion," we proceed to notice THE ARGUMENTS *put forth to sustain them.* These are not many. With all the large books and labored disquisitions which Baptists have given to the world on this subject, a few sentences contain all that they have ever been able to produce in defence of their practice. Indeed, their exclusiveness in this matter so contradicts the whole spirit of the gospel that it will not admit of the merest show of argument in its favor.

Professor Curtis, it is true, thinks he has found in the very constitution of Christianity a principle which sanctions and requires it; but it is mere

theorizing without the slightest foundation. He conceives of Christians as consisting of two classes: first, as simply Christians interiorly and invisibly and individually related to Christ, separate and apart from all ordinances or Church-organizations: second, as Church-members associated together in visible ordinances in particular societies. He teaches that the Lord's Supper, as a Church-ordinance, is not at all for Christians simply as such, but exclusively and only for Christians as they are associated in particular Churches; that each member of such a particular society is entitled to the Lord's Supper, but only in his own particular society or congregation; and that, therefore, from the very constitution of Christianity, there cannot rightfully be any communion in the Supper but close or exclusive communion. We put the argument in its full strength; and yet who is so poorly instructed in the teachings of the Scriptures as for one moment to believe that there is any force or truth in it? To divorce Christianity and the Church, and to separate acceptable saving piety from attention to God's own sacramental means of grace, is to put asunder what God has joined together, to mutilate the whole mediatorial system, to trample the visible economy of grace into insignificance, and to set up "another gospel," which the apostles have not taught. Christ has ordained no two kinds of discipleship, no two armies of saints, no two ways of securing heaven. All men in Christendom must be Christians in the same way, and partake in the common experiences and ordinances prescribed by the Savior, or they are

no Christians at all. We will not undertake to say what shall be the fate of those well-disposed persons who have never had the light and opportunity to become identified with the confessing people of God; but we do hold that he who can find accepted Christian men and women outside of the community of the visible Church or Churches, refusing to confess Christ before men in his own appointed sacraments, finds what does not exist. There are no such Christians; or else the economy of the visible Church or Churches is not at all essential to Christianity, and may be cast aside, without detriment to our immortal hopes, whenever we may see fit. No, no! "There is *one body* and one Spirit; one Lord, one faith, *one baptism*." All the saints have been "baptized by one Spirit into *one body*, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit,"—the spirit of willing and hearty obedience to "whatsoever Christ has commanded." "Except a man be born *of water* AND of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you."

There is often also a very dangerous error concealed in the distinction which some are so fond of making between the visible and the invisible Church. It is true that many hold visible Church-relations who are not living members of the Savior's mystical body, and that it is a matter hidden and invisible to us who are vital and effectual members of the Church and who are not. We may form a proximate judgment in the case; but we cannot always know the facts. But the visible

Church is always supposed to embrace the invisible. Says Ursinus, "*The invisible Church lies concealed in the visible.*" "Whenever we think of *the Church*, we bring before our minds the assemblage of those who are called, which is the visible Church," says Melanchthon; "nor do we dream that any of the elect are elsewhere than in this visible Church; for God may not be invoked nor acknowledged otherwise than as he reveals himself; *nor does he reveal himself* [for the salvation of men] *except in the visible Church*, in which alone the voice of the gospel sounds. We do not feign some other invisible Church." (Loc. Com. vol. i. p. 283.) And, especially as God alone can distinguish his own true people from formalists and hypocrites, it is impossible for us to conceive of them as a separate society distinct from the external Church. Even that part of the Church which has passed away into the invisible world cannot be separated from that visible society on earth in which all the saints in heaven once had their places and in their time helped to fill out its external continuity. The Church is not to be conceived of, on the one hand, as consisting of a system of mere external rites and observances. It has a soul as well as a body. It involves inward faith and spiritual communion and graces as well as outward ceremonies. But neither is it to be conceived of, on the other hand, as having an existence apart from the visible appointments and signs by which alone we can come into saving connection with it. The religion of Christ takes into its essential texture a visible Church,—the organization of its subjects into visible fellowship

with each other and sacramental union with our ascended Lord. And where there is no such visible Church there is no Christian and no Christianity.

All sacraments, then, are for Christians *as such*, and not only for *Churchmen* as distinguished from mere Christians. Nay: if we can be Christians entitled to heaven without communion in the ordinances of fellowship and confession in the visible Church, the visible Church is useless, and Baptists, instead of vindicating ordinances and preserving them from contempt, do really sink them down into matters of indifference, and assume a ground upon which we may refuse both baptism and the Supper without damage to our prospects for eternity. From such theology may the good Lord preserve us and his professing people!

There is a very grave consideration urged by Dr. Fuller in favor of close, exclusive communion, which deserves to be noticed here. He begs "in kindness and affection to submit it to the candor of the brethren." It is, that any other practice would compel him to "receive *infants*"! and to "admit them, though the very Churches in which they are pronounced members would not"! (P. 237.) Surely he has struck upon Gibraltar now, and how can he be expected to go forward in the admission of any but Baptists to the Lord's Supper? *Infants would come.* Fearful thought! Let Christendom pause and consider it. Infants would come; and therefore Baptists are compelled to excommunicate all but Baptists. What ignorance has for centuries pervaded Christendom, in that the Churches have not excluded all but their

own from the Lord's table, lest infants might come from some sister Church, though they never come at home! Grave argument! We leave it where Dr. Fuller has so affectionately and seriously put it,—"to the candor of our brethren."

It is further urged in favor of the Baptist practice in communion that it is just what is done in all other denominations, and that we ought not to blame them for what we ourselves do. Mr. Booth thinks that "the judgment and conduct of Baptists relating to the necessity of baptism in order to communion perfectly coincide with the sentiments and practice of all Pedobaptist Churches." (P. 12.) Now, this is partly true and partly false. It is true that we require baptism as a condition of Church-membership and of communion-privileges; but *it is not true* that we require a particular *mode* of baptism, or that our mere opinion concerning baptism must be acceded to before admission to the Lord's table. The Baptist differs with us as to the nature, subject, and mode of baptism; and yet we do not exclude him from the communion. We hold his responsibility to be not to us, but to his own conscience and to the Lord who instituted the feast; and hence we admit him, if he means thereby to perform an act of devotion to the Savior. But is this the practice of Baptists? By no means. It is not mere *baptism* which they make a prerequisite to communion, but a particular *mode* of baptism, and that administered only after a certain period of the individual's life has expired. They require *immersion*, and that performed subsequent to a personal profession of faith; we demand only

a sincere faith in Christ, accompanied with obedience to Christ's ordinances as the applicant in his own conscience apprehends them. They exclude all except the avowed and active abettors of their sectarian opinions; we exclude none but those excluded by all acknowledged Christians. There is certainly a very wide difference here between their practice and our own. We also carry into our terms of communion those apostolic precepts, "Him that is weak in the faith receive ye, but not to doubtful disputations;" "Receive ye one another, as Christ also received us;" "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we are able to bear?" Baptists, however, deny that these injunctions have any reference to this subject, and refuse to admit or obey them in reference to sacramental communion. In our opinion, Baptists are as much in error as they suppose us to be; yet we are glad to meet them at the Lord's table, whilst they despise our invitations and peremptorily refuse to allow us to sit down with them. Now, with these stubborn facts in view, to say that the judgment and conduct of Baptists on this subject are perfectly coincident with ours is a gross misrepresentation,—an egregious mistake,—if not something a great deal worse. It may serve to confuse and silence the ignorant; but it is not the truth. If the Baptists proceed upon the same principles with us, then let them invite to the Lord's table all whom they regard as Christians, and cease to excommunicate "some of the noblest

lights and ornaments of Christianity" because they do not subscribe to Baptist sectarian opinions.

But none of these considerations reach the real ground of the Baptist "judgment and conduct" upon this subject. All the arguments thus far named are mere after-thoughts, vamped up in the days of controversy to cover the weak flanks of a miserable sectarianism. The real reason of their exclusiveness remains to be told. That reason is that they are compelled to exclude all but Baptists from the Lord's Supper, or compromise their doctrine on the meaning of the word *baptizo*. Slow as they are to say it and cautious as they are in coming to the point, this is the gist of the whole matter; and they cannot deny it. In some shape or other all their advocates have been forced to admit it.

Mr. Booth, after considerable circumlocution, thus presents the case:—"We cannot admit *them* [that is, Christians, not Baptists] to fellowship with us at the Lord's table WITHOUT CONTRADICTING OUR PROFESSED SENTIMENTS. For it appears to us, on the most deliberate inquiry, that *immersion is not a mere circumstance* or a mode of baptism, but essential to the ordinance; so that, in our judgment, he who is *not immersed* is not baptized. *This is* THE PRINCIPLE *on which we proceed in refusing communion to our Pedobaptist brethren.*" (Pp. 12, 13.) Mr. Curtis's elaborate defence of close communion, with all his adroitness in attempting to put the matter on a different basis, goes out from this same centre. In replying to Robert Hall's remark that "no Church has a right to establish terms of communion which are not terms of salvation," he says,

"If this were true, *it would effectually destroy the Baptists as a denomination.*" (P. 139.) Hence his effort to sustain close communion. It is essential to the sectarianism of the Baptist denomination. The holy sacrament of Jesus must be harnessed down in this way, or the Baptist sect ceases! Taking Dr. Fuller's argument all in all, it also sums up in the same thing. "What, in effect," says he, "is the remonstrance we continually address to our brethren? It is *that they are unbaptized* [*unimmersed*]. . . . Now, in not inviting them to the Supper, our conduct *only* repeats this remonstrance,—repeats it silently and kindly, but emphatically. To invite them would really be a want of love, for *it would be an admission that they are baptized* [*immersed*]; and thus, in the strongest manner, *we would contradict our declarations* and confirm them in error." (Pp. 239, 240.) Dr. Howell's whole book upon this subject is but an elaboration of the same idea, as the captions to his chapters will show. We quote a few. "Chapter VIII. We cannot unite with Pedobaptists in sacramental communion without an actual abandonment or practical falsification of all our principles. Chapter IX. We cannot engage in communion with our Pedobaptist brethren, because they are not baptized, having received the rite in infancy. Chapters X. and XI. We cannot commune with Pedobaptists, because, *not having been immersed*, they are not baptized." Thus we have the true secret. Baptists believe that *baptizo* means "immerse and nothing else;" and, rather than allow that they may be mistaken in this interpretation, they take

the harsh alternative of excommunicating millions upon millions of pious people whom they call "brethren" and expect, as they tell us, to meet in heaven!

III. Having thus ascertained the Baptist terms of communion and the ground upon which they are urged and defended, we now come to offer a few comments upon their unchristian and disgraceful implications.

Dr. Fuller mentions it as a distinction of Baptists in all ages, that they "have asserted the glorious right of liberty of conscience for every man, and have sought only to persuade men to cast off spiritual tyranny, whether of State, or creed, or Church, or priest." (P. 215.) Professor Curtis gives "freedom of conscience and religious liberty" as among the chief of "Baptist Principles." We tell these men, in view of what appears above, *that Baptists of their sort, in all ages, have been the advocates and defenders of religious proscription and intolerance hardly less arrogant than that which makes Popery the loathing of the earth.* They may call this wholesale slander, base and unmitigated. But we carry it up to the bar of public judgment and the common Christian sense, satisfied that the decision must be with us. Some Baptists themselves have been convinced of the truth of what we have here said, and have not hesitated to declare it in language equally as strong as that which we have employed.

"I am fully persuaded," says the eloquent and liberal Baptist preacher, Robert Hall, "that few of our brethren have duly reflected on the

strong resemblance which subsists between the pretensions of the Church of Rome and the principles implied in strict communion,—BOTH EQUALLY INTOLERANT; the one armed with pains and penalties, the other, I trust, disdaining such aid; the one the intolerance of power, the other *of weakness.*" "The Romish Church," says he, "pretends to an absolute infallibility; not, however, in such a sense as implies an authority to introduce new doctrine, but merely in the proposal of apostolic traditions and in the interpretation of Scripture. While she admits the Scripture to be the original rule of faith, she requires, under pain of excommunication, that the sense she puts on its words should be received with the same submission with the inspired volume. *In what respects,* let me ask, *is the conduct of the strict Baptists different?* . . . All that infallibility which the Church of Rome pretends to is the right of placing her interpretation of Scripture on a level with the word of God. She professes to promulgate no new revelation, but solely to render her sense of it imperative and binding. And if we presume to treat our fellow-Christians, merely because they differ from us in their construction of a positive precept, as unworthy of being *recognised* as Christ's disciples and disqualified for the communion of saints, WE DEFY ALL THE POWERS OF DISCRIMINATION TO ASCERTAIN THE DIFFERENCE OF THE TWO CASES, OR TO ASSIGN A REASON WHY WE MUST ASCRIBE THE CLAIM OF INFALLIBILITY TO ONE AND NOT TO THE OTHER."

The same author says, further, "Why is the act of debarring every other denomination from admis-

sion [to the Supper] not a *punishment? Solely* because Baptist societies are too few and too insignificant to enable them to realize the effects of their system in its full extent. *Their principle involves an* ABSOLUTE INTERDICT *of Church-privileges to the members of every other community;* but, being an inconsiderable minority, there are not wanting numerous and respectable societies who stand ready to give a welcome reception to the outcasts and to succor the exiles. That their rejection is not followed by its natural consequence—a total privation of the communion of saints—is not to be ascribed in the smallest degree to the liberality or forbearance of strict Baptists, *but solely to their imbecility.* The celebration of the Eucharist they consider as null and void when attended to by a Pedobaptist. His approach to the table is absolutely prohibited within the sphere of their jurisdiction; and, should their principles ever obtain a general prevalence, the commemoration of the love of a crucified Savior would become *impracticable, except to persons of their own persuasion.* Instances have *often* occurred where *the illiberal practice* against which we are contending *has been felt to be a* PUNISHMENT *of no ordinary severity;* where eminently holy men have been so situated that the only opportunity they possessed of celebrating the passion of the Redeemer has been withheld, and they have been *compelled* most reluctantly to forego one of the most exalted privileges of the Church; *nor has it ever been known* that compassion for the peculiar hardships of the case was suffered to suspend *the unrelenting severity of the sentence.* Let

me ask the advocates for the exclusive system whether they would be moved for a moment to extend their indulgence to a solitary individual who differed with them on the subject of baptism, although he was so circumstanced as to render a union with other classes of Christians impossible?" (Hall's Works, vol. i. pp. 358, 450, 475.) And yet this unrelenting proscription of men acknowledged to be saints of God is to be called *"asserting the glorious right of liberty of conscience!"—"opposition to all spiritual tyranny"!!* Alas! alas! for these boasted apostles of freedom of conscience!

Robert Hall says, further, "The advocates of strict communion *are not* engaged in preserving their own liberty, but *in an attack on the liberty of others;* their object is not to preserve the worship in which they join pure from contamination, *but* TO SIT IN JUDGMENT ON THE CONSCIENCES OF THEIR BRETHREN, *and to deny them the privileges of the visible Church,* ON ACCOUNT OF A DIFFERENCE OF OPINION *which is neither imposed on themselves nor deemed fundamental.* They propose to build a Church upon the principle of an absolute exclusion of a multitude of societies, which they must either acknowledge to be true Churches, or be convicted of the greatest absurdity; while for conduct *so monstrous and unnatural* they are precluded from the plea of necessity, because no attempt is made by Pedobaptists to modify their worship or to control the most enlarged exercise of private judgment. . . . It is not a defensive, but an *offensive* measure; *it is not an assertion of Christian liberty* by resisting encroachment,— IT IS ITSELF A VIOLENT ENCROACHMENT ON THE

FREEDOM OF OTHERS, *an effort* TO ENFORCE *a conformity to Baptist views.*" (Hall, vol. i. pp. 334, 335.) These are not our words. We have given the language of one of the most holy, observant, eloquent, and conscientious men the Baptist societies have ever produced. And if it does not fasten down on Dr. Fuller, and all who think with him, the charge of intolerant and even *persecuting* ARROGANCE, it is useless to rely upon the powers of reason and common sense to apprehend truth.

As Protestants, we are accustomed to demand of Romanists whence they derive the right to decide authoritatively against those who conscientiously differ from them. And in the same manner, we ask our Baptist friends where they get the warrant to draw distinctions between God's saints and to enforce their particular views of baptism with ecclesiastical penalties? They pretend to agree that we are Christians. Mr. Carson says, "I gladly admit that many who differ from me with respect to baptism are among *the excellent of the earth.*" Dr. Fuller takes up the same:—"I rejoice to know that in Pedobaptist Churches there are some of *the noblest lights and ornaments of Christianity.*" And Baptists generally profess to have no difficulty in classing many Pedobaptists among the most eminent of the sons of God. What right, then, have they to reject those whom God has adopted? Whence have they authority to prefer the weakest and most inconsistent member of Dr. Fuller's congregation to Brainerd, Doddridge, Baxter, and Arndt, and to say to him, Come and partake of the feast Jesus

has provided for his disciples, whilst they turn away those whose lives exhibit the most varied and elevated forms of moral grandeur, missionary zeal, and even martyr constancy? This is exercising *a legislative power* so high and awful that he who assumes it, in order to justify such conduct, "ought," says Robert Hall, "to exhibit his credentials with a force and splendor of evidence equal at least to those which attested the divine legation of Moses and the prophets," or else be subject to the scorn and condemnation of all right-thinking people, as an usurper seeking to "lord it over God's heritage." For, "by repelling and discountenancing those whom God accepts, to dispute the validity of his seal, and to subject to our miserable scrutiny pretensions that have passed the ordeal and received the sanction of Him who understandeth the hearts, we should have just reason to tremble for the consequences; and, with all our esteem for the piety of many strict Baptists, we conceive it no injury or insult to put up the prayer of our Lord for them:—*Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do!*" (Hall, vol. i. p. 495.)

Another member and minister of the Baptist denomination, Mr. Noel, thus writes:—"According to this doctrine [put forth by strict Baptists], Pedobaptists are *brethren*, yet must not sit down with their brothers at the table of their Elder Brother. As brethren they are Christ's disciples, and therefore commanded by him to eat and drink in memory of him; but they must not eat and drink with their fellow-servants. They are welcome guests to their Lord, but are repelled by their

fellow-guests. Elsewhere they are owned to be brethren, but the chief sign of brotherhood must be withheld from them. They may lead the prayers of their fellow-Christians, and they may instruct the Churches as enlightened and holy ministers of Christ; yet in that ordinance which is specially appointed to be a sign of the communion of saints and the unity of the body, they must be put out, as though they were not members. What a spectacle is thus afforded to the world, who see with contempt that the most earnest followers of the Redeemer cannot even commemorate his death together! When the saints of Jesus are thus excluded from the communion of any of his Churches, are not those who put them out treading in the steps of Diotrephes, though with a different spirit? No: it is replied, 'We are willing to receive all who appear to have been received of God to the ordinances of baptism and the Supper; but we cannot divide the one from the other without dispensing with an institution of Christ.' But this is no reception of them. They can no more force their convictions than you can; and therefore you say to them, in effect, *Unless you will forego what you believe to be a duty, the baptism of infants, and accept us as authoritative expositors of Christ's doctrine, we must expel you from our society* when we commemorate the dying love of our Lord and meet as brethren in his name." (Pp. 291, 292.)

And yet they who take this ground have the effrontery to say to us that it involves no breach of charity, no want of "the highest and noblest fellowship," and no entrenchment upon the freest

operations of the fondest affection. Yes! they will drive us away from the Lord's table as nothing better than *vile dogs,* and yet tell us that they are perfectly bound up with us in love! Upon this point hear again the distinguished Robert Hall:— "Were the children of the same parent, in consequence of the different construction they put on a disputed clause in their father's will, to refuse to eat at the same table or to drink out of the same cup, *it would be ridiculous* for them to pretend that their attachment to each other remained undiminished; *nor is it less so for Christians* to assert that their withdrawing from communion with their brethren is no interruption to their mutual harmony and affection. *It is a serious and* AWFUL *interruption,* and will ever be considered in that light. . . . It is to inflict a wound on the very heart of charity; and if it is not being guilty of *beating our fellow-servant,* we must despair of ascertaining the meaning of terms. . . . It is equally repugnant to reason and offensive to charity. . . . *It is the very essence of schism.*" (Hall's Works, vol. i. pp. 323, 331, 333.)

Dr. Fuller agrees that the Lord's Supper is a *social* ordinance. Among other offices, it is designed to serve as a solemn mode of Christian recognition, by which we show that we are "*one body*" as we partake of "one bread." It is God's own sacrament of Christian fellowship; and to say that to disown us there is no disownment of our Christianity, and no breach of brotherly affection, is to try to persuade us that black is white or that bitter is sweet. Nay: they that do it, says Robert

Hall, to be consistent with themselves, must impute to us a degree of delinquency equal to that which attaches to the most flagrant breaches of morality, and deem us equally guilty in the sight of God with those unjust persons, idolaters, revelers, and extortioners, who are declared incapable of the kingdom of heaven. For if the guilt imputed in this instance is acknowledged to be of a totally different order from that which belongs to the openly vicious and profane, how come we to be included in the same sentence? and where is the equity of animadverting upon unequal faults with equal severity? (Vol. i. p. 338.)

Mr. Noel has put the case in its true position where he says, "If the Pedobaptist be a disobedient unbeliever, reject him from the Lord's table, and also from every other function and privilege exclusively appropriated to believers; if he be an obedient believer, admit him to these functions, but with them admit him also to the Lord's table. But how can the godly Pedobaptist be excluded on these terms? He is no more a disobedient unbeliever than the strictest of the Baptists who would exclude him. The reason why he is a Pedobaptist is, that he believes the baptism of infants to be according to the will of Christ. What person was ever excluded from the Lord's Supper in the apostolic Churches for doing all that he believed, after searching of the Scriptures and listening to apostles, to be according to the will of Christ? What earnest and upright believer was ever in those days excluded? What member of one Church was refused communion with the

members of another? In what apostolic Church were such men as Baxter, Howe, Flavel, Doddridge and Whitefield, Edwards and Payson, Fletcher, Martin, Brainerd, and Chalmers, men full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, walking with God and laboring for Christ, refused such communion? It was reserved for worse days to see so strange a spectacle." (P. 293.)

"Consider," continues this same author, "the real character of this exclusion. Those only are ordered in the word of God to be excluded who are heretical in doctrine, vicious in their practice, schismatical in temper, who injure their brethren, or are openly disobedient to the commands of Christ. But you exclude, in company with all these, some of the most loyal, the most active, the bravest, and the most loving disciples of Christ. They may, like Enoch, walk with God; like Abraham, sacrifice all that is dearest to them to serve him; like Moses, trample under feet the world's most alluring bribes; like Paul, consecrate the noblest faculties with untiring ardor to the cause of their Redeemer; and yet, *because they are not Baptists,* [SIMPLY AND ONLY BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT BAPTISTS,] *you will exclude them from the table of the Lord.* You do this because they will follow what they believe to be the will of Christ, the meaning of his command, and the practice of his apostles; you do this because they do just what you do yourselves,—since you will baptize believers alone, because you think that Christ requires it, and they will baptize infants, because they think that he requires it. You do this, therefore, on a principle

which would justify their exclusion of you; which proscribes all communion among believers, and would substitute submission to human authority for entire, unlimited submission to the authority of Christ. THIS CANNOT BE RIGHT: a more brotherly course is demanded by the plain precepts of Scripture, by the clear proofs of faith and love in Pedobaptist brethren, by the duty of independent judgment inculcated on all." (Pp. 300, 301.)

We therefore hold the Baptist community to it, that to disown us in the celebrations of the Supper is a stab at the unity of Christ, a violent and unchristian unbrotherliness, which is really a disowning us altogether. There is no other alternative. He that is not fit for this communion is not fit for any other communion of a Christian kind. He that is not fit to eat and drink in memory of the Savior, according to that Savior's command, is not fit to die or prepared for the judgment. The terms of communion on earth cannot be stricter than the terms of communion in heaven. If we are not qualified to sit down with Dr. Fuller and his Baptist friends in Baltimore, we are not qualified to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of God. If Baptists have the right and are in duty bound to exclude us from the Lord's Supper, it must be a divine right and a command of God himself; and if such are God's commands as to exclude Luther, Melanchthon, Howe, Leighton, Brainerd, and others like them, from the earthly communion, it is utter folly to suppose God so inconsistent with himself as to receive these men to the sublimer communion in

his own high abode. Dr. Fuller says that he cannot admit such men to the Holy Supper, because this would be to pronounce them qualified for membership in the Church. His language of course implies that they are not members of the Church, and that they are unfit to be recognised as members. But to attack their qualification for membership in the Church militant is at once to impugn their hopes of admission into the Church triumphant, or else to assume the absurd position that men may be in all respects worthy to "walk with Christ in white" illustrious among his ransomed saints, and yet not worthy to sit down and partake of his earthly sacraments! "*Transubstantiation,*" says Robert Hall, "*presents nothing more revolting to the dictates of common sense.*" (Vol. i. p. 499.)

We do not hesitate, therefore,—for we owe it to the truth and to the public,—to arraign these Baptist terms of communion as savoring of Antichrist, and presenting an unqualified outrage on all Christian unity and charity. The common Christian sense and heart revolt at them. Baptists themselves must do violence to all the instincts and feelings implanted by the gospel in the soul before they can adopt them. Dr. Dowling apologizes for Mr. Noel's opposition to close communion on the ground that he was weak enough to follow his Christian impulses! "We cannot but think," says he, "that the amiable author has consulted the promptings of his own kind and benevolent heart, glowing with love to every disciple of Jesus." So, then, according to Mr. Dowling, close communion

is a thing which cannot grow out of a kind, benevolent heart,—out of a heart glowing with love to the disciples of Jesus. It must find origin somewhere else. Dr. Fuller makes a similar concession:—"I myself," says he, "was once strongly opposed to this practice [of close communion], and verily thought, when I united with the Baptists, that I ought to do many things against it, which also I did. Soon, however, I was made to feel that a Christian is to obey not his wishes and feelings, and that principle required me to conform to this custom. This conclusion I arrived at most reluctantly and mutinously." (P. 219.) Thus, while yet his first love was unsullied,—while yet in the youthful tenderness and pristine purity of his Christian experience,—it was offensive to his heart and conscience to think of excommunicating so many myriads of God's saints. Baptists themselves, then, being judges, their practice in communion is totally at war with all the generous impulses which the Spirit of God plants in the bosom of the new convert. No Christian man who has his heart in the right place can adopt it without violence to his own better feelings. Dr. Fuller even now, though "*sorry to find such a man as Baptist Noel advocating open communion*," declares that if he were at liberty to give vent to the feelings of his heart he would joyfully break down the fence and invite all. Why not, then, cherish and follow these holy impulses? Why thus grieve and mortify the Spirit for the sake of the interests of a sect or the support of a dogma which we have shown to be so unfounded and so dangerous? God

certainly has not written in his "living epistles" what he contradicts in his word. And if, at the expense of all their better impulses, at the risk of grieving the Holy Spirit, and with a magisterial arrogance akin to Popery itself, Baptists still persist in disallowing to us the right to eat and drink as Christ commanded, in memory of him, let them not think hard of it when we meet them as we would meet any other railers at our faith or assailants of our hope. We cannot be at peace with those who assume an attitude so lordly, and would stab us in a place so vital. To call us saints of God, and yet to assume authority to exclude us from the communion-table, is a thing for which outward kisses and professions of fraternity will not atone. In point of *fact*, Baptist societies are too imbecile to make their principles effectually inconvenient to us. It is only in point of *principle* that we speak of their conduct as offensive and reprehensible. We can eat the Lord's Supper without seeking it from them. But for them to call us *sons* whilst treating us as *aliens*, and to pronounce us *saints* whilst rejecting us as *pagans*, we will hold to be unchristian, inconsistent, and repugnant to common sense; and we will not be kept by honeyed verbal caresses from denouncing it as God and reason require that it should be denounced. "To disown those whom Christ acknowledges," says Mr. Carson, "is *antichristian disobedience to Christ.* . . . To set at naught the weakest of Christ's little ones," says he, "I call not *illiberal*, but *unchristian.*" (P. 5.) We hold the arbitrary exclusion of us from the communion as a disowning of us and a setting

of us at naught. No ingenuity on earth can reduce it to any thing less. Hall, and Carson, and Noel, and all the best and most distinguished Baptists in Europe, have seen this, and felt it, and acknowledged it. *We* see it, and know it, and feel it, as every candid Christian must. And if Baptists here, to their excommunication of us, will continue to add a mockery of our common sense, by urging themselves upon our Christian regard by telling us what a tender Christian affection they bear toward us, let them not complain if we hold them to be either blind fanatics deceiving themselves, or sectarian hypocrites seeking to impose on our credulity.

We know that our Baptist friends will pronounce such sentiments, as they have already pronounced them, unchristianly severe. But they are not more severe or unchristian, *their own men being judges,* than the sentence of excommunication which they hold with relentless rigor over hosts of acknowledged saints of God. We regret to be driven to make such comments upon the conduct and opinions of any "who profess and call themselves Christians." We would fain take them by the hand and walk with them upon the highway of a common Christianity. We would cheerfully concede to them the utmost freedom of conscience and liberty to administer their baptisms in any mode they may see fit, and still esteem them entitled to our Christian regard. But when they claim infallibility for their interpretation of God's word, as they do by seeking to enforce that interpretation by the pains of excommunication, duty

to God, to ourselves, and to our children demands of us to treat such pretensions in *Baptists* just as we treat similar pretensions in *Papists*. We cannot have respect to persons in things which thus touch the vitals of our Christianity. To tell us that we are flagrant sinners and damnable heretics for baptizing our babes, and that we are alarmingly disobedient to a positive command of Christ because we refuse to disown our baptism as profanity by coming to them to be immersed, and "emphatically to repeat all this," as Dr. Fuller says they do, amid the solemnities of the Holy Supper, by sternly refusing to let us participate, and then to seek to quiet indignation by outside *palaver* about our being saints and the noblest lights and ornaments of Christianity, is not simply ridiculous: it is mockery, a disgrace to any man's profession, an outrage upon common sense which we cannot be expected to wink at, and which we will never cease to stigmatize as it deserves.

In the name of God, we therefore charge all Baptists, and all with sympathies for the Baptist system, as they shall give account in the dreadful judgment, to give to these things a careful and honest consideration. We adjure them, in the name of all that is good and holy, to show how that system can be of God which drives to the enormous extremities of uncharity and presumption involved in their terms of communion. It can be no advantage to them or us to cheat ourselves with lies: therefore let them look for the real truth, and decide before Heaven whether they can any longer give their sanction and influence

to inconsistencies and wrongs so utterly unfounded both in reason and Scripture. We live in trying times. The final battles between truth and error are being fought. The powers of the heavens are shaking and the foundations of the earth are being turned up. "The time is come that judgment must begin." Let men beware, then, how they tamper with the fundamental laws of Christ's kingdom, or legislate terms of communion for the benefit of a sect, or imitate the errors and assumptions of the "Man of Sin." Above all, let no man, at this eleventh hour of the world, presume to remove and re-arrange "the ancient landmarks" which have been standing firm in their places for nearly a score of centuries. "Thus saith the Lord: Stand ye in the ways, and see, and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein." "STAND FAST THEREFORE IN THE LIBERTY WITH WHICH CHRIST HATH MADE US FREE, AND BE NOT ENTANGLED AGAIN WITH THE YOKE OF BONDAGE."

Our review is finished. We have given our testimony. May God bless it to the good of his Church and people! The time will come when it will be thought strange that such an essay should ever have been called for. Truth must be triumphant. The flimsy sophistry and the unblushing impudence by which men have unwittingly or otherwise sought to obscure it, and the tedious processes of reasoning by which such attempts are opposed, will soon be alike forgotten amid the coming victories of a liberal and unstinted Christianity. Before the brightness of the

Savior's appearing all these religious controversies shall vanish. From Jerusalem round about to Illyricum, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth, there shall yet "be one fold and one Shepherd." And in joyful confidence we await the coming time, when from the dwellers in the valleys, and caught up by the inhabitants of the hills, and echoed by the islands over all the seas, shall be heard the apostolic chant of Christian unity:—"ONE LORD, ONE FAITH, ONE BAPTISM, ONE GOD AND FATHER OF ALL, WHO IS ABOVE ALL, AND THROUGH ALL, AND IN ALL."

THE END.

STEREOTYPED BY L. JOHNSON & CO.
PHILADELPHIA.

CATALOGUE

OF

STANDARD LUTHERAN

AND

VALUABLE MISCELLANEOUS WORKS,

PUBLISHED, AND OFFERED FOR SALE BY

T. NEWTON KURTZ,

PUBLISHER, BOOKSELLER AND STATIONER,

NO. 151 WEST PRATT STREET, BALTIMORE, Md.

Orders for any of the Books in the following Catalogue (which can be sent per mail at the rate of one cent per oz. if pre-paid), or for anything else in the Book and Stationery line, will be promptly attended to if addressed to T. NEWTON KURTZ, No. 151 Pratt Street, Baltimore, Md.

THE GENERAL SYNOD'S

STANDARD ENGLISH LITURGY,

for the use of Evangelical Lutheran Churches in the United States; two editions—12mo. and octavo.

The new GERMAN LITURGY (prepared by the Pennsylvania Synod), 12mo. and large 8vo. bound in the various styles, also for sale at the publisher's prices.

ENGLISH LUTHERAN HYMN-BOOKS.

GENERAL SYNOD'S STANDARD EDITIONS—Of which there are *four* editions published, viz.:

48mo.	or	miniature edition,
24mo.	"	medium "
12mo.	"	large "
8vo.	"	pulpit "

Each size is bound in various styles, and sold entirely for *cash.*

GERMAN LUTHERAN HYMN-BOOKS.

EVANG. LIEDER-SAMMLUNG—General Synod's *standard* edition.

DEUTCHES GESANGBUCH—Pennsylvania Synod's edition.

GEMEINSCHAFTLICHES GESANGBUCH—New York or Union edition.

ENGLISH LUTHERAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL HYMN-BOOK.

With a view to the more extensive use of this Hymn-Book in our Sunday-Schools, the prices have been much reduced, and they are now offered at a very small advance on the *prime cost;* and as there is no reason why it should not be used *altogether* in our Sunday-Schools (for the book is as well adapted for the purpose as any published in the country), we trust our Superintendents and Teachers will make an effort to introduce it generally.

It is bound in various styles.

GERMAN LUTHERAN SUNDAY-SCHOOL HYMN-BOOK.

Authorized to be published by the Penn. Synod—32mo., half roan.

ENGLISH LUTHERAN CATECHISMS.

LUTHER'S SMALLER CATECHISM—Gen. Synod's *standard* edition.

LUTHER'S SHORTER CATECHISM—Illustrated by additional Questions and Answers, by J. G. Morris, D.D., 18mo., half sheep.

THE SERIAL CATECHISM, or Progressive (Religious) Instructor for Children, prepared with a special view to *Infant and Sunday-Schools*, in two numbers. They can be had separately or bound together.

A SHORT EXPLANATION OF LUTHER'S SMALLER CATECHISM, with Scripture Proofs and Illustrations, prepared by Rev. Dr. Mann, and published by the authority of the Synod of Penn-

sylvania, for the use of Families, Catechumens, and Sunday-Schools—18mo., half morocco.

GERMAN LUTHERAN CATECHISMS.

DR. LUTHER'S KLEINER CATECHISMUS—West Pennsylvania Synod's new and *improved* edition, containing the Formula of Discipline, Augsburg Confession, &c. 18mo., half sheep.

KURZE ERKLARUNG DES KLEINEN KATECHISMUS. Dr. Martin Luther's, mit Beygefugten Bibelstellen Zum Gebrauche. In Familien, fur Confirmanden-Unterricht, Katechisation, und Sonntagsschulen. Herausgegeben mit Kirchlicher Genehmigung. This is the *Explanation of Luther's Smaller Catechism*, by Rev. Dr. Mann, in German, and authorized to be published by the Pennsylvania Synod. 18mo. half roan.

LUTHERAN PRAYER-BOOK.

For the use of Families and Individuals, with Introductory Remarks on Family Prayer, together with a selection of 176 HYMNS, with Music or Tunes adapted to them. By B. KURTZ, D.D. *Second edition*, revised, enlarged, and *much improved.*

"This Prayer-Book has been prepared mainly for the English portion of the Lutheran Church, yet it is believed nothing will be found in it to prevent its free use in any Protestant Christian family. In the German language we are abundantly supplied with such helps; but in English, a general and complete Prayer Book, adapted to daily devotion, to special occasions, and to every emergency, has thus far remained a desideratum, which it has been our aim to supply. It is, therefore, hoped that the Lutheran Church especially will encourage this enterprise."—*Extract from the Author's Preface.*

The rapid sale of the first edition (nearly 4000 copies) of this work, and the favor with which it has been received by the Church generally, has induced the publisher to have it thoroughly revised, enlarged, and greatly improved, and it is now believed to be equal, and in some respects superior to any similar work published in the English language.

It is a large duodecimo volume, of nearly 600 pages, printed on large, clear type, and bound in various styles. The following is a synopsis of the contents:

A Valuable *Table* to guide in reading the Holy Scriptures systematically; and also *References* to select portions of the same.

Introduction—Prayer in all its Forms.

Morning and Evening Prayers, with Scripture (reading) Lessons for every day for eight weeks.

Prayers for Particular Days.

Occasional and Special Prayers and Thanksgivings.

Prayers before and after Meals.

Prayers for Children.

Prayers for Little Children, in prose and verse.

Form for opening *Sunday-Schools*, with Prayers annexed.

A selection of 176 HYMNS, with 61 popular TUNES adapted to them.

WHY ARE YOU A LUTHERAN? or a Series of Dissertations, explanatory of the Doctrines, Government, Discipline, Liturgical Economy, Distinctive Traits, &c., of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. By B. Kurtz, D.D., with an Introduction by John G. Morris, D.D. 12mo.

"We believe that the extensive *circulation* and *perusal* of this publication (*Why are You a Lutheran?*) among our people, will be the means of rectifying many mistakes, and diffusing correct information in regard to Lutheranism; and that its general distribution will also tend to the prevention and removal of unfounded prejudices in the case of many candid and serious persons of other denominations, who are willing to investigate before they censure or condemn."

The above is an extract from a Recommendation signed by many of our most eminent ministers, such as Dr. S. S. Schmucker, Dr. Reynolds, Dr. Krauth, Dr. Bachman, Dr. Morris, Dr. H. N. Pohlman, Dr. S. W. Harkey, the late Dr. E. Keller, Revs. P. Rizer, W. A. Passavant, J. Z. Senderling, S. R. Boyer, F. R. Anspach, John Heck, A. Babb, A. H. Lochman, &c. It is bound in various styles, and sold at reduced prices.

AMERICAN LUTHERANISM VINDICATED! or an Impartial **Examination of the Lutheran Symbols**, on certain Disputed Topics, including a Reply to Rev. W. J. Mann's "Plea for the Augsburg Confession," published by the "Lutheran Board of Publication." By S. S. Schmucker, D.D.—12mo. cloth,

ELEMENTS OF POPULAR THEOLOGY—With special reference to the *Doctrines of the Reformation*, as avowed before the Diet at Augsburg, in MDXXX, by S. S. Schmucker, D.D.—8vo. sheep.

The same work—abridged, and adapted particularly to use in the Lutheran Church. 12mo., cloth.

THE AMERICAN LUTHERAN CHURCH—Historically, Doctrinally, and Practically delineated in several occasional Discourses, by S. S. Schmucker, D.D.—12mo., cloth.

THE LUTHERAN MANUAL ON SCRIPTURAL PRINCIPLES; or, The Augsburg Confession illustrated and sustained, chiefly by Scripture proofs, and extracts from Standard Lutheran Theologians of Europe and America; together with the Formula of Government and Discipline adopted by the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, by S. S. Schmucker, D.D.—12mo., cloth.

SCHMUCKER ON THE REFORMATION—18mo., cloth.

SCHMUCKER'S PORTRAITURE OF LUTHERANISM—18mo.

DEFINITE PLATFORM—Doctrinal and Disciplinarian, for Evangelical Lutheran District Synods, constructed in accordance with the Principles of the General Synod.—thin 12mo.

TO ROME AND BACK AGAIN, OR THE TWO PROSELYTES. By J. G. Morris, D.D.—12mo., cloth.

THE BLIND GIRL OF WITTENBERG; A Life-Picture of the Times of Luther and the Reformation. From the German, by J. G. Morris, D.D. 12mo., cloth.

THE LIFE OF JOHN ARNDT—Author of the Work on "True Christianity." By John G. Morris, D.D. 18mo., cloth, with a correct portrait of ARNDT.

This work is a biography of one of the ablest men and most distinguished servants of God the world ever produced, and is now offered for the first time in the English language. It should be read by every Lutheran and Christian in the land.

THE CATECHUMEN'S AND COMMUNICANT'S COMPANION. For the use of young persons of the Lutheran Church, receiving instruction preparatory to Confirmation and the Lord's Supper, with forms of Prayer for one week, and special cases and occasions. By J. G. Morris, D.D. Third edition, revised and corrected, 18mo., cloth.

EXPOSITION OF THE GOSPELS—*Luke and John*—Designed for the use of Families, Bible Classes, and Sunday Schools.—By Rev. J. G. Morris, D.D. and Rev. Charles A. Smith, D.D., 12mo. cloth.

THE CHARACTER AND VALUE OF AN EVANGELICAL MINISTRY, and the Duty of the Church in Regard to it. By Rev. Simeon W. Harkey, D.D., Professor of Theology in Illinois State University—18mo. cloth.

"The writer of this work believes that the greatest want, as well as the greatest hope and the greatest blessing of this country and of the world, is a faithful and well-qualified *Evangelical Ministry.* So deeply is he convinced of this, that he has solemnly consecrated the

remainder of his life, be it worth much or little, to the great work of increasing the number of true ministers of Christ. My object has been to *do good*—to stir up 'the pure minds of ministers and people by way of remembrance,' and to come to the help of my brethren who are bearing 'the burden and heat of the day' in the Master's vineyard.

"I would commend the book to the attention of all Christians, and especially to my beloved *brethren in the ministry*, and hope that they may find great benefit by circulating it freely among the people of their churches."—*Extract from the Author's Preface.*

LECTURES ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE HEBREWS—By Rev. J. A. Seiss, A.M., 8vo. This is a *valuable work*, highly recommended by several of our Synods and most eminent clergymen. There are but few left.

THE BAPTIST SYSTEM EXAMINED, The Church Vindicated, and Sectarianism Rebuked. A Review of "Fuller on Baptism and the Terms of Communion." By Fedelis Scrutator—thick 18mo. cloth.

LIFE OF MARTIN LUTHER—Being a comprehensive, though condensed and correct History of the Life and stupendous achievements of the Great Reformer. By Rev. R. Weiser, 12mo. cloth—new edition, revised and corrected. The same work, illustrated with fifteen engravings, representing the most important events in Luther's life and history.

THE LIFE OF LUTHER—With Special Reference to its Earlier Periods, and the opening Scenes of the Reformation. By Barnas Sears, D.D. This is an original work; with three fine steel and twenty-three wood engravings, all finished in the highest style of the art—12mo. cloth.

A DEFENCE OF LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. By John Bachman, D.D., LL.D., against the Charges of John Bellinger, M.D., and others; to which are appended various Communications of other Protestant and Roman Catholic writers who engaged in the controversy. Large 12mo. cloth.

REGINA, OR THE LITTLE GERMAN CAPTIVE. By Rev. R. Weiser, Professor in Central College of Iowa, Fort Des Moines. Thick 18mo., cloth.

This is an intensely interesting narrative of a little German girl, who was stolen by the Indians, and retained in captivity *nine years*, and finally restored to her mother. It should be in the library of every Christian family and *Sunday School* in the land. It is illustrated with several beautiful and appropriate engravings.

MEMOIR OF REV. WALTER GUNN, late Missionary in India, from the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, by G. A. Lintner, D.D., 18mo. cloth.

A MANUAL OF CHRISTIAN BAPTISM: INFANT BAPTISM, AND THE MODE—By Rev. Thomas Lape, A.M. Sixth edition; corrected and enlarged—18mo.

This is a brief, yet comprehensive work in favor of *Infant* Baptism, and presents the whole controversy in so simple a form and clear a light, that all who read can understand it.

DISCIPLINE, ARTICLES OF FAITH, AND SYNODICAL CONSTITUTION, AS ADOPTED BY THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SYNOD OF SOUTH CAROLINA, and adjacent States, to which is added a Liturgy, and some forms of Prayer for families and individuals—12mo. cloth.

HISTORY OF THE SALZBURGERS AND THEIR DESCENDANTS. By Rev. P. A. Strobel—12mo. cloth.

MANUAL OF SACRED HISTORY—A guide to the understanding of the Divine Plan of Salvation, according to its Historical Development. By John Henry Kurtz, D.D., Professor of Church History in the University of Dorpat, etc. Translated from the sixth German edition, by Rev. Prof. Charles F. Schaeffer, D.D.—Large 12mo.

THE CHILDREN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. Dr. Stork.

THE SEPULCHRES OF OUR DEPARTED. By Rev. F. R. Anspach, A.M.—12mo. cloth.

THE LIFE OF PHILIP MELANCTHON, the Friend and Companion of Luther, according to his Inner and Outer Life. Translated from the German of Charles Frederick Ledderhose, by the Rev. G. F. Krotel, of Lancaster, Pa., with a portrait of Melancthon—12mo.

MEMOIR OF THE LIFE AND TIMES OF HENRY MELCHOIR MUHLENBERG, D.D., Patriarch of the Evang. Luth. Church in America. By M. L. Stoever, A.M., Professor in Penn. College. 12mo., cloth.

LUTHER'S CHRISTMAS TREE, by Rev. Dr. Stork,—illustrated with six large engravings, representing important events in the life and times of Luther. Small 4to., paper.

STARCK'S PRAYER-BOOK—In German and English—12mo.

SCHMUCKER'S (Dr. J. G.) EXPLANATION OF THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN—In English and German—12mo., with a portrait of the author. ☞ There are but *few left* of this work.

JOHANN ARNDT'S WAHRES CHRISTENTHUM—ARNDT'S TRUE CHRISTIANITY—In German and English, large 8vo. shp.

THE CHRISTIAN BOOK OF CONCORD, or Symbolical Books of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, comprising the Three Chief

Symbols, the unaltered Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms, the Formula of Concord, and an Appendix. To which is prefixed an Historical Introduction. Second edition, carefully revised by Rev. Drs. C. P. Krauth, W. M. Reynolds, J. G. Morris, C. F. Schaeffer, and Rev. W. F. Lehman. Translated from the German—large 8vo., sheep.

THE UNALTERED AUGSBURG CONFESSION, and the Three Chief Symbols of the Christian Church, with Historical Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes. By Christian Heinrich Schott; carefully translated from the German. 12mo., cloth.

THEOLOGICAL SKETCH BOOK, or Skeletons of Sermons—2 vols. 8vo., half cloth.

HAZELIUS' CHURCH HISTORY—12mo.

LUTHER'S COMMENTARY on Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, to which is prefixed Tischer's Life of Luther; also a Sketch of the Life of Zuingle, in English and German—large 8vo., sheep.

SELECT TREATISES OF MARTIN LUTHER, with the Original German, by Rev. B. Sears. 12mo., cloth.

THE CANTICA SACRA; a Collection of Church Music, embracing, besides some new pieces, a choice selection of German and English Chorals, Set Pieces, Chants, &c., from the best European and American authors, adapted to the various metres in use, with the Text in *German and English*, by Rev. J. J. Fast.

ENGLISH LUTHERAN ALMANAC—Containing valuable statistical and general information of the Church; also a complete list of all the Lutheran Ministers in the United States, with their Post-Office address, carefully corrected—published *annually*.

BLANK CERTIFICATES of Ordination, Licensure, Confirmation and Marriage. The form and style of these Certificates are entirely new and very neat.

STANDARD THEOLOGICAL

AND

VALUABLE MISCELLANEOUS BOOKS.

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF JAMES ARMINIUS, D.D., formerly Professor of Divinity in the University of Leyden. Translated from the Latin, with a Sketch of the Life of the Author.

It may not be generally known that only two of the three vols. of the Works of Arminius have ever been published in the English language, viz.: The edition published in 1825, by James Nichols, London—the third volume either never having been translated, or if it was, never republished; it remains for an American translator to render the third volume into English, and for an American publishing house to first offer, in the English tongue, the complete Works of the *Great Expounder* of the Arminian System. The competency of the American translator for his task is vouched for by those who know him best, and who are well and favorably known by the literary and religious public. The works of Arminius make three handsome octavo vols. of about 600 pages each, well printed on fair type, bound in cloth.

THE COMPREHENSIVE COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE—Containing Scott's Marginal References; Matt. Henry's Commentary; Practical Observations of Rev. Thomas Scott, D.D., with extensive Explanatory, Critical, and Philological Notes, selected from Scott, Doddridge, Gill, Adam Clark, Patrick, Poole, Lowth, Burder, Harmer, Calmet, Stuart, Robinson, Bush, Rosenmueller, Bloomfield, and many other writers on the Scriptures. The whole designed to be a Digest and combination of the advantages of the *best Bible Commentaries*, embracing all that is valuable in Henry, Scott, Doddridge, &c. In six volumes, super royal octavo, bound in full, strong sheep.

CLARKE'S COMPLETE COMMENTARY ON THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT—4 vols. super royal 8vo., in full strong sheep.

CLARKE'S COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT—2 vols. super royal 8vo., full sheep.

SIMMON'S SCRIPTURE MANUAL, Alphabetically and systematically arranged, designed to facilitate the finding of *proof-texts.* This is a truly valuable work.

MACKNIGHT ON THE EPISTLES, with a Commentary and Notes; to which is added a *History of the Apostle Paul.*

CHRIST'S SERMON ON THE MOUNT.—A beautiful little miniature volume, printed on *large type*, intended as a *pocket manual* for frequent perusal. It is a very appropriate *present* from a pastor to a church member, or from one pious friend to another.

THE HISTORY, DOCTRINE, GOVERNMENT AND STATISTICS OF THE RELIGIOUS DENOMINATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES, with a preliminary sketch of Judaism, Paganism, and Mohammedanism, by Joseph Belcher, D.D. Embellished with nearly 200 fine engravings, large 8vo. roan, embossed.

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D., 25 vols. 12mo.

BARNES' NOTES ON THE NEW TESTAMENT, 11 vols. 12mo.

Do. Do. JOB, DANIEL, AND ISAIAH—5 vols. 12mo.

LIVES AND TIMES of the Most Distinguished CHRISTIAN FATHERS, to the close of the 3d century, 8vo. sheep.

GAILLARD'S CHURCH HISTORY—8vo. stiff paper.

GATHERED TREASURES FROM THE MINES OF LITERATURE; containing Tales, Sketches, Anecdotes, and Gems of Thought; Literary, Moral, Pleasing, and Instructive, 8vo. roan embossed.

PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, with engravings, 18mo., cloth.—A good edition of this excellent work.

LOOKING-GLASS; or, Intellectual Mirror—A Juvenile Book, with 64 engravings, 18mo., cloth.

DODDRIDGE'S RISE AND PROGRESS OF RELIGION IN THE SOUL—32mo., cloth.

KEMPIS' CHRISTIAN'S PATTERN—32mo., cloth.

MASON ON SELF-KNOWLEDGE—32mo., cloth.

MRS. ROWE'S DEVOTIONAL EXERCISES OF THE HEART.—32mo., cloth.

YOUNG AMERICAN; or, Book of Government and Law, by Peter Parley—12mo., half morocco.

JESUS' WITNESSES, or the "Great Salvation Exemplified." 12mo.

THE COMPLETE WORKS OF THOMAS DICK, LL.D. Illustrated with numerous engravings, 2 vols., 8vo., sheep.

PLUTARCH'S LIVES—8vo., sheep. A good edition.

THE SPECTATOR—by *Addison*, 8vo., sheep.

ROLLIN'S ANCIENT HISTORY—2 vols., 8vo., sheep.

THE WRITINGS OF REV. LORENZO DOW, containing his Experience and Travels in Europe and America; also his Polemic writings, 8vo.

BOOK-KEEPING BY SINGLE AND DOUBLE ENTRY.

Simplified and arranged, according to the present Practice of well-regulated Counting Houses in the United States. By John H. Shea, Accountant.

This is a *practical* system, and is considered one of the *best works* on the subject of *Book-keeping* extant. It is now offered at a *reduced price.*

This Treatise comprises FORMS of RECEIPTS, DRAFTS, BILLS OF PARCELS, ACCOUNTS CURRENT, and such Accounts as usually occur in actual business.

Also, USEFUL CALCULATIONS of Interest, Equations or Average of Payments, and a VOCABULARY of Commercial Terms, in ALPHABETICAL ORDER.

It contains a SERIES OF LECTURES ON DOUBLE ENTRY, peculiarly adapted to extensive and complicated business.

The LECTURES include a variety of Questions concerning Domestic Business—Discounting and Renewing Bills—Importing and Exporting—the purchase and sale of Bills of Exchange—Commission and Company Accounts, both *Domestic* and *Foreign.*

TO

SUPERINTENDENTS AND TEACHERS

OF

SUNDAY SCHOOLS.

The undersigned respectfully announces that he is Agent for the sale of the publications of the

MASSACHUSETTS SABBATH SCHOOL SOCIETY.

And is prepared to furnish them at the *lowest catalogue prices.*

These publications are entirely *different* from those published by any other Sunday School Society, and are now so well and favorably known throughout the country, that no special recommendation is deemed necessary.

The whole number of bound volumes of this Society is about 700, varying in price from 7 cents to $1. They publish 20 different volumes of Scripture Question Books for Sabbath Schools, and a large number of *Catechisms for Infant Schools.*

The Society has put up six Selected Libraries, viz.:

Little Boy's and Girl's Library,	25 vols. for	$3 00
The Infant's Library,	40 vols. for	5 00
The Sabbath School Library,	100 vols. for	10 00
The Family Library,	25 vols. for	10 00
The Children's Library,	100 vols. for	18 00
The Youth's Library,	150 vols. for	30 00

The prices of these Sabbath School publications are fully as *low*, if not lower, than any other similar Books published in the country, and are regarded as unexceptionable on the score of sectarianism.

A full assortment will always be kept on hand and for sale by the undersigned. *Terms cash.*

☞ Catalogues, with the price annexed to each book, will be furnished gratis, when applied for.

Also, a large assortment of SCHOOL AND CLASSICAL BOOKS, Pulpit and Family BIBLES, Books of Common (Episcopal) Prayer, Hymn Books of the various Denominations, Church Music Books, PAPER, and STATIONERY generally, for sale at WHOLESALE AND RETAIL by

T. NEWTON KURTZ,
PUBLISHER, BOOKSELLER, AND STATIONER,
No. 151 West Pratt Street, Baltimore, Md.

